97-84039-29

Monroe, Paul

Papers on educational problems in mission fields

New York

1921

97-84039-29
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 122

International missionary council.
Papers on educational problems in mission fields ... [issued by the International missionary council, New York city, November, 1921]
71 p. 23½ cm.

Half-title.
Contents.-- I. Mission education and national policy, by Paul Monroe.— II. Education for life and duty, by Sir Michael E. Sadler.— III. The crisis in Christian education in the mission field, by J. H. Oldham.

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-5-97 INITIALS: PB

TRACKING # : 22513

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

308
N
Box 122

PAPERS ON EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN MISSION FIELDS

I. Mission Education and National Policy, by Professor Paul Monroe.

II. Education for Life and Duty, by Sir Michael E. Sadler.

III. The Crisis in Christian Education in the Mission Field, by Mr. J. H. Oldham.

INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL

FOREWORD

These papers are issued by the International Missionary Council to facilitate the study of certain of the most momentous and pressing educational problems in mission fields. They are not to be regarded as official declarations of policy on the part of the International Missionary Council. The first two of these papers appeared in recent numbers of the *International Review of Missions*. The publication in this form is made possible by the generous initiative and cooperation of the Committee on Social and Religious Surveys.

JOHN R. MOTT.

New York City,
November, 1921.

M.W.E. Aug. 1, '23.

MISSION EDUCATION AND NATIONAL POLICY

BY PROFESSOR PAUL MONROE, PH.D., LL.D.

I

DURING the past two hundred years two great political forces have been operative in society, that of democracy and that of nationality. The stronger and the more nearly universal of the two has been nationality. During the earlier part of the period the factors that were thought to produce or to foster nationality were racial homogeneity, religious unity and a common language. Other conditions were also deemed essential, such as geographical unity, a centralized government and similar factors. However, with the growth of democratic ideas and practices it became obvious that, though important, these factors were not the sole or even the essential elements of nationality. The development of the American nation particularly demonstrated that strong nationality might be compatible with or even dependent upon freedom in religious thought and practices and upon the obliteration of racial lines through complete freedom of immigration.

Not only in America but more especially in Europe it came to be recognized that some factor, more inclusive than language, religion or race, formed the basis of effective nationality. This more fundamental basis was recognized as a common culture. By this term is meant not the English idea of culture—an intellectual attainment plus an æsthetic appreciation—but a community of ideas, purposes, traditions, institutions accurately indicated by the German word *Kultur*. In fact the Teutonic peoples during the eighteenth century were the first to become conscious of the political significance of *Kultur*. Moreover, they made an additional discovery:

FOREWORD

These papers are issued by the International Missionary Council to facilitate the study of certain of the most momentous and pressing educational problems in mission fields. They are not to be regarded as official declarations of policy on the part of the International Missionary Council. The first two of these papers appeared in recent numbers of the *International Review of Missions*. The publication in this form is made possible by the generous initiative and cooperation of the Committee on Social and Religious Surveys.

JOHN R. MOTT.

New York City,
November, 1921.

M.W.E. Aug. 1, '23.

MISSION EDUCATION AND NATIONAL POLICY

BY PROFESSOR PAUL MONROE, PH.D., LL.D.

I

DURING the past two hundred years two great political forces have been operative in society, that of democracy and that of nationality. The stronger and the more nearly universal of the two has been nationality. During the earlier part of the period the factors that were thought to produce or to foster nationality were racial homogeneity, religious unity and a common language. Other conditions were also deemed essential, such as geographical unity, a centralized government and similar factors. However, with the growth of democratic ideas and practices it became obvious that, though important, these factors were not the sole or even the essential elements of nationality. The development of the American nation particularly demonstrated that strong nationality might be compatible with or even dependent upon freedom in religious thought and practices and upon the obliteration of racial lines through complete freedom of immigration.

Not only in America but more especially in Europe it came to be recognized that some factor, more inclusive than language, religion or race, formed the basis of effective nationality. This more fundamental basis was recognized as a common culture. By this term is meant not the English idea of culture—an intellectual attainment plus an æsthetic appreciation—but a community of ideas, purposes, traditions, institutions accurately indicated by the German word *Kultur*. In fact the Teutonic peoples during the eighteenth century were the first to become conscious of the political significance of *Kultur*. Moreover, they made an additional discovery:

namely, that this common culture, unlike race, is an artificial product. It can be manufactured. The process of manufacture is education; not education in the traditional English sense—the attainment of individual culture—but education as a process controlled by the state for political ends. Hence came the development of national systems of education, first of all by the various Teutonic peoples, then by the other European nations, then by the United States; last of all advanced nations, by the English. In fact only in our own generation have either the people of the United States or those of England come to consider education as a national process which is to produce the common culture essential to a strong nationality. Even yet the more popular view conceives education as a matter of individual interest, based on individual effort and aiming at individual culture. On the other hand nearly all other nations, including, be it noted, many if not most peoples toward whom missionary efforts are directed, conceive of education as a group process, legitimately to be controlled by the government for the production of a common culture. To this political conception of education both the American and the English governments and peoples are now committed. It is in this sense that education will hereafter be considered in this article.

Education in this group sense conforms to certain laws or principles which are operative in a greater or less degree in all countries; more effectively, perhaps, in countries to which mission education is directed than in the English speaking countries from which missions come. Mission education, it is true, aims at objects beyond those involved in the national or cultural education; it has distinct motives of evangelization and ideals of the development of Christian character in its students. With these distinct aims this article does not deal. But to be successful it must conform to the more fundamental social principles which control education as conceived and carried on by the people for whom it exists.

More specifically the writer would argue that to be effective permanently, mission education must so affect the principles and the organization of the group cultural education as conceived by the non-Christian peoples that the ideals aimed at by the missions may to some extent be included in

these principles and this organization. This may be done in two ways; first, by modifying the ideals, spirit and purpose of the dominant state education; second, by operating educational experiments which will force the dominant system to imitate the higher type. The most direct way to accomplish the first of these objects is to contribute directly to the state system, wherever possible, through the training of teachers.

The second thesis which the writer urges, based upon the above analysis, is that mission education in the near future is apt to be much less influential than at present, because of the failure to take into consideration the two suggestions made. In the first place the mission schools have paid so little attention to the training of teachers that in many regions they cannot staff their own schools and in few or none can they make any contribution to the teaching staff of the government schools. In the second place the missionary bodies are attempting so much in the way of education, and are wasting so much through competition, overlapping and lack of co-ordination, that however strong some of these institutions now are they will shortly be so outdistanced by government institutions that they will lose relatively much of the influence they now have. Moreover, within the present or the next generation, native institutions will be so developed and so strongly intrenched that the mission education can exert little influence on the government system. When that time arrives the best students will turn to government schools and the missions will have lost their great opportunity. It is true that there will yet remain, perhaps will always remain, the opportunity to accomplish much good through the education of a relatively few individuals, and through assistance to the local program of evangelization; but the larger opportunity will have been missed.

However, missions operate under such diverse circumstances and among peoples of such different stages of culture that a further analysis is necessary before attempting concrete application.

In the process of developing a common culture as a basis for nationality three distinct stages may be noted, in each of which missions are now operating. In the first, people are still living in tribal form, under genetic rather than political

institutions. Political organization in these cases is now almost universally provided through colonial control.

In the second stage, the peoples are in a transitional state of political organization and are consciously seeking to replace the indigenous culture with the artificial modern product of a common culture. Some of these people, as the Chinese, may have a high degree of native culture, may indeed be more highly "cultured" than Western peoples, but that culture is inadequate to the demands of the modern world. Such people have become conscious of the importance of a common culture, of the kind which may be manufactured by the direct processes of education, and are seeking to replace the indigenous form by the modern product.

In the third stage, the people, having become fully self-conscious of this process, have succeeded in perfecting the machinery for replacing the old culture with the modern one through an effective school system.

In each of these stages the cultural system and the educational process conform to distinctive principles or laws peculiar to the given stage. It is a further argument of the writer that mission education should conform to these conditions. In other words, it is argued that the mission education policy for people in the first stage should be very different from that in the second and the third; that in the second or third it should differ from that in each of the others. This argument may be supported by the following application.

II

The first stage, that of primitive cultures, is illustrated by the various African peoples, the non-Christian peoples of the Philippines and of the East Indies, and no doubt by other groups. With such peoples the fundamental need is not for a literary education, but for one which will include all the essential elements of modern civilization and Christian culture. Education along economic lines should give them modern methods in industry and in agriculture, which will enable them to become self-supporting in a new environment, to contribute to the world channels of trade and to avoid exploitation by Christian nations. For such peoples the missions should lay

great stress upon trade or industrial schools and upon agricultural schools. An education which is merely literary is apt to result in the separation of its beneficiaries from the masses of the people, in the creation of an intellectual caste which in time leads to an exploitation of the masses by their own leaders little less reprehensible than exploitation by outsiders. Such peoples need an education in personal hygiene and in public health which will enable them to withstand the evils introduced by commerce and by new conditions of living; this may be necessary to prevent complete extermination such as has actually occurred in the case of some peoples of the Pacific islands among whom missions operated early in the nineteenth century. Such peoples need a moral education which will enable them to withstand the contact with the morals—or the *mores*—as well as the immoralities of Christian civilization. They need an intellectual education also, but one associated not so much with books and linguistics as with the simple practical processes of the life which they must lead. All the educational elements mentioned can be blended in such practical schools and all, including the intellectual, will be far more effective than if isolated in a modern academic procedure. What is needed is the education of a Hampton or Tuskegee, not that of a New England college or high school. The methods of the latter would benefit a few individuals, but for the most part would entirely eliminate them from their native environment or would nullify their native influence. Religious leaders these people need and such leaders must be produced and trained; but their influence would be exerted more effectively through the religious aspects of occupation, family life, social customs, than through philosophical and theological effort. Their native religion is intimately connected with their industries, their home and tribal customs, and every act and thought of daily life; the higher religion which replaces the genetic one should be no less intimately connected with all these.

III

With the second stage of this cultural development the problem grows more difficult; in fact it presents the greatest

difficulties of the three, both because it is most complex and because it is fraught with the greatest possibilities and promise. Here would be included China, India of the past and the Near East, the great mission fields of the world. Such peoples possess cultures far older than our own, almost as complex, just as stable, perhaps even more so, and in many essential respects just as high. But with the exception of the Near East population, these cultures do not include Christian ideals. And, reverting to our main thesis, such peoples are not yet conscious, or are just becoming conscious of the significance of a common culture as a basis of group unity and of group progress. They are becoming conscious also of the significance of a controlled educational process as a means to this national unity and progress—far more conscious of it than are the mission educators who work among them. Therein lies one serious aspect of the present situation.

Let us try to analyze the educational problem at this stage. From our point of view these people need all the elements of a Christian culture. From their own point of view they need an education which will give them all the essential elements of complex modern culture. It is not possible to give them only a religious education and expect that to stand. It is not possible to give them an intellectual education only and expect that to function. We do not undertake at home to convert an individual to the Christian life and attempt to influence only his religious thought and feeling. We expect his religion to affect his conduct in vocation, in family life, in politics, in social relations. It is true that it does sometimes happen that a man is converted only as to his religious life, the change not visibly affecting his business practices and his other relations. But we are not so proud of the result as to seek to reproduce it elsewhere. And with us the individual so "educated" has the advantage of working in institutions and following customs that are substantially controlled by Christian ideals. The convert in a non-Christian land has not this benefit. Hence the necessity of seeking to modify every phase of culture, of developing every phase of a Christian community, of training leaders in every phase of social life, in industry, in commerce, in politics

and the professions; of developing the laity as well as religious leaders, and of attempting to establish on the basis of Christian principles all the essential aspects of modern culture. An attempt to give a religious education which is inhospitable to modern scientific ideas, or which is not accompanied by a training in modern science, will defeat its own ends. A mission education that does not make provision for the training of future political and social leaders will eventually find itself situated in a society of modern structure with governors hostile to the education which neglected this essential feature. When the third stage of development is reached, as may soon be in all these countries, such political leaders will have both power and means for the realization of their hostile purpose.

Let us confine our discussion for the moment to one country, China. The education which China needs, and of her own volition is now seeking, includes all the elements of modern culture, industrial, economic, hygienic, medical, scientific, political, social, professional, religious. Mission education must offer no less, or at least must offer the preparation for no less. The root of the difficulty is that mission education was formulated when in essential aspects China was in the early stages of the second culture period. Perhaps even yet the basal organization of Chinese society is the genetic one of family or clan rather than political. Therein lies the political problem of that people. A further difficulty is the enormousness of the problem. It had to be attacked piecemeal; efforts had to be confined to small groups, to isolated localities. To this day the need as well as the opportunity is so great and the results so significant that it is difficult to consent to sacrifice isolated efforts in favour of a larger plan which contemplates the future as well as the present.

The magnitude of the problem is such that a definite and rational policy should be adopted. It is so huge that no agency save that of the conscious organization of the entire group, that is the nation, can accomplish it. Hence the missions must seek for some other aim than the education of the masses; that is, of all of the people even in any one community. Only an organized Chinese people, acting through their own government, can do that. And, when so organized, the nation will do it irrespective of what mission education

may desire. Nor can missions look forward to educating all the leaders or even attempting to do so; that possibility is passed even now. One native institution, the national university, has now nearly 2500 students, of university or at least higher grade, pursuing Western science. It has a budget of nearly a million dollars and has on its staff of three hundred some distinguished world scholars. Practically a part of the same institution is the higher normal school, with eight hundred additional students, a half million additional budget. The combined institutions have a staff of over 400, nearly a fourth of whom are returned from foreign training. Probably all the mission institutions of higher grade combined cannot equal this one in budget, student body, staff or number of returned students employed. The government plans four such institutions; the missions have two or three times this number aspiring to be colleges or universities. Mission education must seek some other aim than this.

Can such an aim legitimately be found in the support of a considerable number of institutions of higher learning, including professional schools? The budget submitted for one such agricultural school as planned for the future totals $100,000. Many such at home cost much more. Engineering schools demand even a more generous support; the Peking Union Medical College has a budget of $800,000, which is about the expense of a similar institution at home. Though this school cannot hope to train one one-thousandth of the physicians which China will need, the China Medical Board has withdrawn other contemplated schools of a similar character as beyond its ability to support. Can the missions contemplate more? The task of training all the professional experts which China will ultimately need and will soon demand is one impossible for private resources. When the Chinese people come into full self-consciousness and political self-control, it is certain that they will not permit the training of the bulk of the nation's professional experts at any time by private authorities, even were this feasible.

What then should be done? As one policy it is possible to develop a considerable number of agricultural, medical and other professional schools or colleges of moderate proportions, meeting needs that are urgent with the expectation

that they will soon be outclassed by government institutions. Then the outclassed mission schools either can be abandoned or turned over to the control and support of the native Church or of private authorities. As a second policy these schools may be allowed to vegetate as second-rate institutions or less, to be viewed with indifference by the Chinese. A Western institution inferior to a native one has little prestige in the Orient. A third, and it would seem a better, plan would be to limit higher educational activities to a very few institutions, attempting professional work in any one line in only one or two institutions. The purpose would then become to make the work in any one line so excellent and so effective that it would serve as a model for similar work undertaken by government authorities, and to train efficient leaders for these professions rather than the rank and file. The mission forces now probably have at their command the educational resources to do this better than the government can, and have also the moral force which the government lacks. The adoption of this plan would mean the cessation of competition among a large number of institutions inadequately supported and equipped and the elimination of overlapping. It would mean also a close adjustment of mission education to its Chinese environment.

One of the two chief objections made by the graduates of mission schools who have come into wider contact with Western education is that their training failed to give them any close contacts with the actual conditions of Chinese life; the object of the missions seems to have been to establish replicas of New England colleges or of English public schools without any sufficient consideration of their relation to the Chinese environment, including native religious and moral ideals. The force of such criticism is now assuming serious proportions. The most feasible way of obviating this criticism through academic channels is through motivation of the scholastic work through direct relation to the needs of Chinese society. When such motivation is called vocational or pre-vocational or industrial or professional, it is apt to arouse the antagonism of many mission educators. Some reflection and inquiry, however, will reveal the fact that the chief difficulty with American collegiate education is the same, namely, that it

lacks adequate motivation. Intellectual curiosity, desire for learning as such, or the research motive may be sufficient for the instructor; it is seldom sufficient for the student. He needs and demands a more concrete and a more immediately realizable end. The search for such motivation is the chief characteristic of present conditions in higher education in America. The most obvious solution is the beginning of professional work at the end of the junior college, as is done in practically all state universities and in most of the great endowed universities. The chief reason it is not done in the smaller institutions is the prohibitive expense of administration. Probably the majority of American college students are so grouped in professional or pre-professional courses. There is no reason why such a policy should not be followed in the mission schools of China. This would coincide with the government educational projects, with tendencies in America, with practices long existing in Europe, and with modern educational thought.

One notable exception should be made to this generalization, and this for two reasons. In the training of leaders in religious life, in politics or in law, an intellectual education should be given as rich and as prolonged as the economic condition of society makes possible. For in all the countries in this second stage of culture development, which is practically all of the Orient, learning is in high repute for its own sake. The learned man, the teacher, the student is held in higher esteem there than in any country of the Occident. Western culture if it is to replace the Oriental must be represented by learned men, by intellectual leaders who are the peers of the intellectual leaders of the old culture. Hence the leaders in Christian thought, in religious life, in civic and public life must receive the widest possible intellectual training. The second reason is that the subject matter of the senior college course is usually that necessary for training in these professions. In its origin, and for long thereafter, the American college furnished the professional training for these two careers of Church and State. Even yet the general materials included in the law course in continental European countries and in Latin America is usually presupposed in American law schools and hence incorporated in the college

curriculum. In other words the senior college really becomes a professional or pre-professional course for the minister and for political and legal leaders.

Secondary education presents a somewhat similar problem though one of greater extent. The secondary school aims primarily at the selection and training of the leaders. Particularly is this true if this secondary school follows European tradition and includes the training of the pupil from the eleventh or twelfth years of age to the eighteenth or nineteenth. To accomplish this end the period may be divided into two schools, to conform to government standards, though it will doubtless ultimately seem to be most advantageous to organize the period into one school unit of from six to eight years in length.

The social function of secondary schools is to select pupils of the necessary ability to continue into the professional schools, and in a larger way to prepare the rank and file of leadership in all lines. The opportunity and need are so great and the task for China is so huge that it is a legitimate aim, and one promising adequate returns for the missions, to enter the secondary school field to the extent that the work can be well done without limiting other policies. However, it is far better to do a limited amount well than a larger amount poorly; better, that is, for the ultimate attainment of the aims of mission education. It is true also that much of this should frankly be vocational or pre-vocational, for the reason advanced above.

The scheme of organization should synchronize with that of the government in order that the secondary and higher mission schools may be able to draw largely from the government elementary and secondary schools, while the government higher schools under certain conditions may draw from the mission secondary schools. The facilitation of these interchanges will advance the great purpose of mission education, namely, to exert a Christian influence in moulding the character of the native leaders of the coming generation.

As to elementary education perhaps but one additional consideration enters the argument. For the present the need is so great that every effort is worth while; elementary schools are needed as feeders to the higher schools; they are needed

as models for government or native schools. The additional consideration is that mission elementary schools will be needed for the nurture of the Christian community, until the government or other native schools are so permeated with Christian spirit and purpose that the children of the Christian community may with safety be left to them. As the ultimate aim is to bring about this transformation in Chinese society, it may be said that the test of the success of mission education is the extent to which it may eliminate itself.

There is one other fact which to the writer seems the most important of all. If the immediate object of mission education is to bring Christian influences, ideals and purposes to bear on the Chinese youth, there would seem to be no more effective way of doing this on a large scale than by shaping the character of those who are to teach and control the government schools. By such means mission influence on one Chinese boy or girl may be multiplied a thousand-fold, and be exerted by and exemplified in those through whom China must be Christianized, if ever—namely, by the Chinese themselves. Yet comparatively little is being done in this respect and that little of very recent origin. Some years ago the writer visited a considerable number of mission centres and found in all of them efficient schools, many of them with fine plants. In some centres there were several such plants. In only three or four of these centres was any effort being made towards the training of teachers and that in a most desultory way. He recalls no such class that had more than a score of pupils. Yet in each one of these centres government normal schools for both men and women were visited, having an attendance of from two hundred to a thousand each. All of these students were taught after the Japanese method and in the Japanese spirit. Yet in these same regions the government officials were willing to use all the teachers that the mission schools could furnish. It seems lamentable that so great an opportunity was missed and is still being missed.

The responsibility for this situation lies not wholly on the shoulders of mission administration. It is but a part of English and American tradition. In no progressive country in the world, including China, Japan, Latin America and most countries of Europe, is so little emphasis placed on the

training of teachers. The reason for this condition is simple. Education has been conceived of as a local not a national function. Its purpose has not been to develop a social culture upon which a strong bureaucratic or even autocratic government could be built. Democratic, not nationalistic ideals have controlled. Initiative, self-dependence, "self-activity," self-control, have been aimed at in the pupil; the same characteristics have been deemed quite sufficient for the teachers. Hence an elaborate technical training supervised and provided by the government has not been deemed essential. This situation is now generally admitted to be quite inadequate. And it is a serious error for Western educators to repeat the mistake where higher standards are set up.

It is even a greater mistake to send over untrained teachers to serve as models in competition with trained teachers. The very fact that the mission teacher comes as a representative of a superior education sets him up as a model. It may be freely admitted that the mission educator has a vast advantage in the knowledge of the subject matter to be imparted, in personal culture and in force of personality; but a knowledge of technique is often quite as important. At least it gives its possessor the feeling that it is. All the government teachers have had from one to four years of technical training, many of them in Japan, some few abroad. To see the American college graduate blundering through the process of teaching the elements of his native language, because he has had no training in the technique, and is probably even unconscious that such training exists, and to compare his work with that of his Chinese neighbour who is engaged in a similar process, and who has had two or more years' training in technique, though it may have been mechanical, brings no credit to the former.

Professional study is desirable even aside from technique. Suppose an argument arises whether secondary education should include professional or vocational courses. The untrained teacher probably would not know, though his Chinese educational acquaintance might, that at least forty per cent of the two million pupils in the secondary schools of the United States are majoring in vocational lines; that twenty-

eight per cent of the total are in the one field of commercial education. Suppose the argument was that the mission schools should follow the American plan and have an eight year elementary course instead of a five or six. He probably would not know, as his professionally trained friend might, that 500,000 American children are now in junior high schools instead of the old seventh or eighth grades. Perhaps the question in dispute is whether academic collegiate training should extend the non-professional work of the student through a period of sixteen years or whether the senior college should offer professional and pre-professional courses. The American college graduate's experience would probably not acquaint him with the fact that with few exceptions all American universities allow and provide for this plan and that most professional students adopt it.

The point of the argument is that American mission educators need a professional training before they are sent out as truly as do medical or religious workers. To omit this is not fair to them, to their constituency, or to those among whom they work. Further, it is urged that larger provision should be made for the higher training of native teachers in mission normal schools and that normal courses should be established in numerous secondary schools as well as in colleges. The Philippine experience shows that a fairly effective teacher training can be given even in the intermediate school. This, however, was in a less complex society and was an expedient to furnish quickly the large number of teachers required for a government system.

Throughout the whole educational programme there should be sought as an objective a close contact with Chinese life, an approximation to the spirit of the Chinese or to their thought life, an attempt to carry over as much of their old culture as is compatible with the new. In some respects the mission schools may be doing this. But the failure to preserve the contact with Chinese life and thought results in an exotic religion and culture and detracts from the realization of the primary aim of mission work—the Christianization of China. This being the first of the criticisms offered by the products of mission schools, the second one may be properly mentioned

here—namely, that too little use is made of the product of mission work and of the natives in general in the operation, control and direction of mission work, educational and otherwise. The failure to do this now does of course delay the realization of the ultimate purpose of turning all work over to the native Christian Church. The point of the argument is that it should be done progressively and as rapidly as possible. Whether the second criticism is just or not the writer cannot state, but he is able to affirm that it is one frequently made.

To summarize the significance of the second stage of social development and mission work, it may be pointed out that its chief characteristic is the vague recognition by the people of the importance of education as a means of developing a common culture which will serve as a basis for nationality, without their having as yet developed the power to control the process.

The classic example is in the Balkans. Here Greek schools, Bulgarian schools, Serbian schools, Turkish schools, even Armenian schools, Italian schools, American, British and French schools have competed to this end. All of them are looked upon by the natives and by the local governments as direct proselyting agencies for their respective peoples. A partial exception may be made in the case of the British and American schools. With the same exceptions it may be frankly admitted that the schools are such agencies. Political allegiance follows the religions; schools determine the religion of their pupils and indicate that of their parents. In both the fact and the common recognition of the fact by the natives lies the necessity of a mission policy which should meet this condition.

All the peoples of this second group are making great effort to acquire such self-control—a political and cultural control through schools. The chief problem for mission education is to formulate and adopt such a policy as will preserve their influence, as will allow it to make the maximum contribution now and to retain its influence on ideals and purpose, as will permit it to offer models and to continue to contribute effectively to leadership when the culture development shall pass into the third stage.

IV

The third stage of cultural development is reached when the group attains complete self-consciousness, sets up definite group aims, and constructs and supports an efficient political government which adopts definite procedures for realizing these ends. The most fundamental of these group aims is that of creating, maintaining and developing a common culture. The most significant of the procedures for realizing these ends, and the only one adequate to secure a common culture, is a nationally controlled system of education.

Mission education in such countries confronts a quite different problem from that found in the earlier stages. Mission work in Europe, in Latin America and in Japan would fall into this group. Here it is obvious that there may be two distinct situations, one in which the dominant government and the peoples are Christian, the other in which they are non-Christian. But the political and social principles underlying educational work would be largely the same in the two cases. Mission work and mission education in the Christian lands would obviously have a much more restricted object and a narrower justification. Into the question of the ethical and religious principles involved here, this article will not enter. To arrive at the social and political principles involved, it will suffice to consider the one outstanding non-Christian nation of this group, namely, Japan.

The outstanding fact that mission education must face in its work with all peoples of this third group is that such people have determined to use education as a means to a national end and that they may consequently compel non-governmental education to conform to many of the fundamental requirements of state education. Their political, social and even ethical right to do this cannot be gainsaid. These requirements relate usually to the qualifications of the teacher, to the subjects taught, to the relative number of nationals and non-nationals in the administrative and teaching staff, to the actual administration of the school and to the teaching of religion.

It is the application of some or of all these requirements that has caused the curtailment of mission education in Japan and has restricted its influence. It is a similar situation that

is causing so much trouble in Korea at present and that promises difficulty in China, India and the Near East, in the future. Since the enforcement of such requirements is often objected to by the mission educator, by his supporters and by his administrative superiors, and since this situation promises to be a most serious problem in the future, let us examine its premises briefly before discussing an advisable policy.

The requirement which caused most curtailment of mission work in Japan was that the teachers should have a given number of years of professional training. All teachers in the elementary schools of Japan must have had four years of normal school work, and all in secondary schools must also have had secondary school education preliminary to the professional. All schools possessing rights similar to government schools must have on their staff a certain proportion of teachers measuring up to these minimum standards. Mission administrators do not yet have any adequate conception of the importance of the professional training of teachers, so naturally the mission schools were not prepared to fulfil such requirements and suffered accordingly. Not that mission educators and mission administrators were wholly to blame. The American people as a whole have no such standards and have no such belief in the professional training of teachers. The facts available are not entirely comparable but they are these: The Japanese teacher in the elementary school must be a graduate of a normal school which gives him a professional training of four or even five years and is approximately equivalent in length to our secondary school. The teacher of a secondary school must have a professional training of four years which is beyond the secondary school. In the United States less than fifty per cent of our 650,000 public school teachers have the requirement of a full high school education; less than twenty per cent have a high school education plus a two year professional training. The question is, is it advisable to set up an inferior professional standard in a foreign country even in the name of missions; and, if so, is it advantageous to the missions themselves to do so?

Reverting to a previous argument that is pertinent at this point, it is the prospective application of this requirement to non-governmental schools that is apt to furnish the point of

contact and of conflict between the government education and missions in China. At present it looks as though the missions would not be prepared and the government will be in the right as to position and principle.

The second requirement which is apt to cause difficulty is that all instruction must be given in the native language. This is now accepted without debate so far as schools in Japan are concerned. The difficulty arises in the colonies or the lands subject to the Japanese, especially Korea, a question discussed in the following paragraph. A more serious aspect of the question will arise when the Chinese government shall establish this rule. Wherever this point has been considered in the United States, legislation has always enunciated the principle that all schools should be taught in the English language. Numerous commonwealths have adopted such requirements. Wherever the question is up, the attitude of the American people is unquestioned, namely that they have a right to make such a requirement for the security of their culture and political institutions. American interests operating in foreign lands are in no position to advocate any other policy.

A third requirement which may cause difficulty is that of certain minimum essentials of the curriculum. The point here lies in the inclusion of elements which are considered essential to the native culture or the exclusion of elements which may be considered essential to the culture of the mission educator. The mission schools naturally find it difficult to teach Japanese history and political theory as they are taught in the government schools. It becomes more difficult to do this in Japanese-controlled Korea. Has the Japanese government the right to demand this and must the mission schools conform? When the Japanese government objects to the teaching of the American Revolution and the patriotic services of Washington, or of the American Civil War in the schools of Korea, because of the political influence of such teaching, what answer is to be given?

Before answering authoritatively, one must study the attitude of American governments towards similar questions. Certain American states have recently passed very drastic laws directed towards controlling the economic and political

beliefs of teachers. It is hardly to be denied that there has developed or is developing a new orthodoxy. The question of religious orthodoxy no longer interests the masses of the people or the government authorities. But the question of political and economic orthodoxy does. Without discussing the merits of the case here, the one point of concern is perhaps obvious. As believers in democracy we can hardly demand privileges in foreign lands which we are not prepared to grant in our own land. It is not sufficient to answer that as individuals we do not accept this position. As long as our governments exercise such rights, we are in no position to deny them to foreign governments under which we seek to exercise the privilege of educating their youth.

A fourth point concerns the administration of schools. It is probably admitted that as a matter of policy it is best among peoples where the government is entirely competent to have mission schools administered by natives. The problem arises acutely when this becomes a legal requirement. This condition is likely to arise soon, the precedent being set by Christian nations. If we revert to our fundamental thesis, that education is now recognized as the means for determining the culture of a people and that all individuals should participate in such a culture, the validity of such a demand can hardly be questioned.

The fifth problem, which is the most serious of all to mission educators, concerns the teaching of religion. Declaring Shintoism not a religion but a system of political and social ethics, the Japanese bar the teaching of religion in the schools. The same attitude may be taken by the Chinese regarding Confucianism. The Japanese government forbids the teaching of religion in mission schools to which the privilege of government schools of the same grade are granted, but has allowed the teaching of religion in these schools if it is not a part of the regular curriculum or during the regular school hours. In doing this they claim to be following American precedent. If we grant that mission schools having the privilege of government schools are in fact government schools, this claim can hardly be denied; for it does not seem to be possible that mission schools can exercise the

right of government schools and yet refuse to accept obligations of such schools.

In this position Japan is but acting on the principles followed or at least sanctioned by other governments. This much will be granted. Difficulty and sharp disagreement will arise concerning two other applications of this theory. One difficulty has already arisen. In certain regions, at least, the Japanese government has declared that religious instruction offered after school hours, if given to substantially the same body as constitutes the school population, even though other than school buildings are used for this purpose, is in fact religious instruction in the schools. This is carrying the separation of religion from education further than Americans, whether interested in missions or not, are prepared to sanction, or to consider within the proper scope of government. No American experience can be considered as a precedent; neither law, nor tradition, nor form of government would permit it. What political ground we might have for combating this decision is another question. Whether the Japanese government will persist in this attitude cannot be said, for the question is still under discussion. Certainly adherence to this view would place mission educational activities under such handicap as to render the accomplishment of their main purpose impossible.

This position of the Japanese government is taken on the grounds that religion forms no part of education; that the missionaries are free to engage in religious activities and propaganda as they may wish so long as no law is contravened; but that education is a government function, and that if such function is delegated to non-governmental agencies, such agencies must confine their activities within educational lines. This attitude foreshadows the second point of disagreement, a view which, if adopted, will render mission education almost impossible. Considering the recent rapid development of education as a function of government, for the purpose of determining the basal culture of a people, and thus laying the foundation of the social and political structure, it is quite possible that government should limit the exercise of this function to its own agents. In practice a number of European countries have substantially reached

this position. All but a small fraction of the school population in these countries are in government schools, and those that are not are closely supervised. The French government has added to this situation the exclusion of religious teachers from the government teaching staff. The new Mexican constitution makes just this proposition: that none but natives with government authorization can teach. While this is not as yet enforced, it may be. It is towards such a position as this that the governments of the world, particularly those of less developed or smaller peoples, are moving.

It is through no unfriendliness towards or lack of appreciation of missions that this situation is pointed out by the writer. But it certainly is the part of wisdom for mission educators to take cognizance of the tendencies, to keep the conditions in view and to attempt to formulate their policies in accordance with the situation.

V

To the three types of culture and political organization under which missions operate a fourth must now be added, chiefly as a result of the war. This final type includes the so-called mandatories, to which should be added Korea and probably India. The characteristic of this type is the dominance of a people in the first or second stage by one of the third stage, to the end that the culture development of the fostered people shall be assimilated to that of the dominant one. The present world situation indicates that possibly, if not probably, all colonial governments will be transferred to this group. Certainly less freedom is to be allowed to missionary agencies in all such regions than in the pre-war period. The immediate future will reveal whether India is to be transferred to this stage, so far as mission educational activities are concerned, instead of to the third stage. The same problem arises in Egypt, with the indication that shortly the mission problem there will fall into the third stage. In certain fundamental aspects the mission problem in the Philippines under the American government lies in this fourth group. However, here the educational force is so much more under control of democratic than nationalistic ideas that the

problem of the relation of missions and government hardly arises. The fundamental democratic principles that nationality should be based upon complete religious freedom, upon the separation of religion and public education, and upon a fusion of social elements and interests rather than upon racial identity, have controlled the educational situation in the Philippines; consequently, notwithstanding the fact that the established government education has required the use of the foreign tongue of the dominant colonial government and has included as minimum requirements essential elements of the dominating culture, yet these have favoured the development of a common native culture. Complete freedom has been allowed to mission education and to native educational endeavour. The only pressure that has been applied is the attractive, rather than the compulsory, force of a superior educational scheme.

Even the brief experience of the last few months indicates that a much more rigid policy in the control of mission, as well as of all other education, is to be exerted by those governments holding colonial or mandatory power. The experience of several years in Korea indicates the validity of this statement and also shows some of the results of such policy. It cannot be denied that all such governments are likely to exert considerable authority in controlling the culture development of their colonial wards to the end that it may be sympathetic towards the culture of the controlling power and favourable to its economic and political welfare. Despite the announced principles regarding mandatories, requiring that they shall be exercised for the benefit of their wards, it is quite evident that the real effect of this guardianship will be to direct their development for the advantage of the controlling power. Perhaps this may change in the near future. The recent action of the English government in India in relinquishing the control of education to the native provincial governments is the most significant step in this direction yet taken.

There is extreme, and it seems unnecessary, reticence in regard to the present situation, but a few facts may be cited to prove the point. In the Near East, American evangelical institutions of long standing have been com-

pelled to change the language of instruction from English to French; in some of these the mass of the Roman Catholic Church must be celebrated for the children. Other institutions of high repute, built up by great investment of funds and lives, are being forced to contemplate removal from French mandatory territory to the regions of English mandate. In India the English government has excluded all German missionaries for a period of five years with the promise to reconsider the question at the end of that period.

In Korea the policy has been carried further than in any other region. Here the Japanese government has required that every missionary school shall give instruction in the Japanese language. This requirement placed such a burden on the numerous small mission schools conducted in Korea, through the necessity of employing expensive instruction in the Japanese tongue, that many of them had to be abandoned. Other requirements as to the minimum program of instruction added burdens, towards which mission schools as well as natives were unsympathetic.

Whether acceptable or not it is obvious that such colonial governments are going to exercise powers quite unfavourable to mission educational activities as carried on in the past and that they have the political power and the political right to do so. Before answering the question as to whether they are also morally justified, we should inquire concerning the action of the American state governments in the conduct of education during the past few years.

Numerous states of the American Union have passed laws requiring that all instruction in private as well as public schools shall be in the English language, allowing the use of a foreign tongue only in the study of that language. It is quite obvious that such laws have the approval of the masses of the people. Such legislation has the same object and is based upon the same principles as similar action in these colonial regions; namely, that of shaping the cultural ideals and activities of all the people towards the common end of a national unity. Many communities have gone to the length of forbidding any instruction in the German language in the common schools. Numerous communities exclude instruction in German from the secondary schools as

well. This latter is obviously temporary, and an evidence of war psychology. The other laws ante-dated the war but had not been enforced. Several states of the Union adopted laws eliminating teachers holding unorthodox views on political and economic questions. Some of these are quite as extreme as those cited above for the control of the character of school teachers. New York proposed inquisitorial laws to the same end that were quite as drastic as any in operation in other lands. The chief difference is this: that in a democratic community the enforcement of such laws is quite impossible in the face of the opposition or even the indifference of the mass of the people; while under an autocratic government, such as any colonial government is apt to be, the operation of such legislation is entirely feasible, even automatic.

Since mission education is face to face with such conditions in numerous regions, it may be well to summarize the essential aspects of the situation. Such mandatory governments are apt to impose fundamental requirements upon all schools, public and private; first among these is that of instruction through an official language, not necessarily the native one and not the one native to the missionaries. Second is the requirement of certain minimum subjects of study, including the language and literature, the history and institutions of the governing power. Third is the requirement of certain qualifications of teachers, particularly as to length and character of professional training; fourth, the national allegiance of the teaching staff and of the administrative head of the school.

Mission education will find it quite difficult to adjust itself to this situation. The third requirement may be expanded into a fifth if it should be made to include designated political and economic beliefs, or a given attitude towards the existing government. If this should be required, as it is by some American state authorities, mission education will find itself in an impossible situation.

To these stipulations may be added a sixth, that no religious instruction may be given in schools of any character. This would be defended on the grounds that all education aims to determine the culture of a people; that this culture

is essentially a matter of political or national concern; that individual or outside interests may be free to appeal to the religious interests of the people but that they may not do this through any control of educational channels which serve as a substitute for governmental educational agencies. Both Japan and Mexico have clearly indicated an approach to this position.

VI

In the face of our own policy, American missions cannot justly require a different one of a foreign government. Nor can they properly rely on the power of our own government to force the adoption of a more favourable or lenient policy in a foreign land. Even if success crowned such an effort, it is obvious that mission education or any religious work which must rely on political or military force is stultified and in the end ineffective.

It is obvious that mission education in these lands is facing a serious and a difficult problem. It is also obvious that old policies and ideas and the old attitude of indifference toward the governments under which they work, or toward the culture which they seek to modify, can no longer persist. It is perhaps impossible to forecast the future or to state the lines of policy which missionaries should pursue.

Certain guiding principles, perhaps, may be suggested as tentative proposals; merely tentative, since it appears that the general political situation of the immediate future is quite a new one.

Recognition of a government authority and the right of a superior government policy with regard to the components of a group-culture, and means for securing this, must be recognized. Mission education should adapt itself to the government education so far as this is not incompatible with its essential religious aims. It should seek to co-operate with and to contribute to this government policy so far as possible. It should hold fast, however, to the fundamental purpose of aiding the people for whom it labours. To this end missions must seek as rapidly as possible to throw the control, direction, and support of education and religious

training upon the natives themselves. They should recognize that their influence on the educational policy of the government will probably be limited to the indirect pressure which can be exerted through the maintenance of superior or model educational enterprises, and through shaping the character of native or government leaders and teachers. To this end they should endeavour to educate leaders through their secondary and higher schools and to train teachers through their normal schools. It should be recognized that their present contribution to the latter end is woefully inadequate.

This article is written with keen appreciation of the result of mission education in the past and the present, and in the hope that its ultimate aims may be realized in the future. It is written also under the assumption that these ultimate aims do not include the perpetuation of our denominational organization and sectarian differences among people for whom such differences can have little of the historical justification which they may have with us; but under the assumption that the fundamental desire is to establish a native Christian Church which may assume as speedily as possible the entire task of Christianizing the culture of the whole people, and that these ends are to be secured through the Christianization of as many as possible of the individual participants of that culture. The writer also assumes that such peoples are entitled to make their own interpretation of Christianity in the light of their own culture, their own modes of thought and their own historic backgrounds. If Japan could assimilate all the essential elements of the material culture of western civilization in one or two generations, this does not seem an impossible task. It would also seem, in the light of Japanese experience, to be wiser to urge and assist such peoples to make their own organization and interpretation of Christianity than to insist that they must fit themselves into the peculiar and perhaps temporary moulds of existing Western thought and organization.

Mission education, merely as education, even aside from its Christian motivation has much to contribute to these retarded or recently emerged cultures. The fundamental importance of personality, the necessity of individual variation as the basis of progress, the significance of individual initiation in social, political and industrial life, the value and the virtues of democracy, the deadening influence of a mechanical bureaucracy through a letter perfect technique are all to be conserved as of highest importance. But this can only be done by avoidance of some of the obvious shortcomings of democratic education, by breadth and tolerance of view and by the incorporation of some of the acknowledged virtues of the nationalistic conception of education. In these respects the problems of mission education are the problems of education at home.

The function of privately controlled education at home is to point the way to educational advance through its greater freedom of initiative and experimentation. The function of education inspired by the religious motive is to formulate and work out a comprehensive scheme of education which shall include essential elements of culture and personality which are apt to be minimized or neglected in the mass education controlled by the public. The function in mission education is to serve these purposes abroad in much more difficult situations.

EDUCATION FOR LIFE AND DUTY

By Sir MICHAEL E. SADLER, K.C.S.I.

In all parts of the English-speaking world students of education are indebted to Dr. Paul Monroe. To his labours and to those of his colleagues we owe the comprehensive *Cyclopaedia of Education* (Macmillan) which, apart from its value as a book of reference, will stand as a tide-mark of our generation's insight into the significance of the teacher's art. Dr. Monroe also commands our respect from the fact that he holds the chair of the History of Education at Teachers College in Columbia University, New York. The magnitude of Teachers College, the range of the studies which it represents and the fine generosity of its foundation encourage everywhere, and not least in England and in India, those who long for a more adequate recognition of the value of an intelligent and scientific investigation of the difficult and elusive questions which underlie the practice of education.

In the important article on "Mission Education and National Policy" which he contributed to the last issue of this Review Dr. Monroe has done a further public service by recording his "keen appreciation of the result of mission education in the past and the present." Writing with the authority of a skilled observer, he draws public attention to the fact that "the problems of mission education are the problems of education at home." He reminds us that recently developments, even in American education, have disclosed certain dangers. "A mass education, controlled by the public," may "minimize or neglect the essential elements of culture and personality." "Democratic education has some obvious shortcomings which should be avoided." Even under the surface of "a letter-perfect technique," there may be felt "the deadening influence of a mechanical bureaucracy." It may not be thought unbecoming on the part of an English student

of the subject to say how deeply he feels the debt of the modern world, and especially of Britain, to the educational enterprise of America; to its verve, its courage, its liberality, its incessant experiments, its readiness to take stock of itself and to adjust itself to new social needs. Courage and candour are great moral forces. Both of them are displayed by the true leaders of American education, and are not absent from Dr. Monroe's article. Full of respect for the great achievements of public authority in American education, he sees nevertheless that the wisdom of public authority should be strengthened by the counterpoise of private initiative. "The function of privately controlled education at home is to point the way to educational advance through its greater freedom of initiative and experimentation. The function of education inspired by a religious motive is to formulate and work out a comprehensive scheme of education which should include essential elements of culture and personality which are apt to be minimized or neglected in the mass education controlled by the public. The function in mission education is to serve these purposes abroad in much more difficult situations."

Great is the significance of such a judgment falling from the lips of a scholar in Dr. Monroe's position. It means that the members of one of the largest training colleges in the world are watching the educational work of Christian missions and are endeavouring to assimilate their experience. In each great university, the missionary educator should feel that he has a home base. There, as well as at the headquarters of his society, his labours should be followed with sympathetic and critical attention. To the generous imagination of the young men and women in British and American universities (not to speak of the universities of France, Central Europe and India) the human experience of the missionary, of the pioneer and of the overseas administrator makes its appeal. Mr. H. G. Wells, whose responsive sympathy gives warmth and variety to his writings, has just said in his wrath that "the British universities have no philosophy of education and hardly any idea of an educational duty to the community as a whole."[1] If this is true, it is high time

[1] *The New Teaching of History.* By H. G. Wells (Cassell, 1921), p. 7.

that we university people were warned of our failure in a plain duty and were bidden repent. Study of missionary education, of its difficulties and political problems, will help to carry us into the heart of the labyrinth where the great secrets lie. Already we can see signs of the change which a candid and respectful study of missionary problems is making in university thought. The academic outlook, especially among the younger men and women, has been widened. *Abeunt studia in mores.* And the Student Christian Movement has helped in preparing the field for this new seed. Missionary work abroad and Christian work at home are but two aspects of one and the same duty. Educational policy in the West needs the light which missionary experience throws upon its problems and presuppositions. When intellectual opinion in France was still averse from learning what Christian experience has to teach, the pavilion of Roman Catholic missions at the Paris Exhibition of 1900 revealed to the student that, in its deep foundations, French education rests upon the Christian ethic as well as upon critical exactitude.

The leaven of these contrasted influences (contrasted only until they harmonize in a new concord) is working in European and Indian as well as in American and Chinese thought. Dr. Monroe is so good as to disclose to his readers his own disquietude of mind, his uneasiness at the insufficiency of some current political generalizations to cover all the facts revealed by missionary experience. We in England are similarly harassed by the misfit of some of our educational presuppositions when we are called upon to apply them to the varied problems of the mission field. But, through our having undertaken earlier than the Americans or the Germans responsibilities for overseas government we have been saved from committing ourselves as whole-heartedly as they to dogmas which are too narrow to embrace all the pertinent facts. Overseas experience has held back the English judgment from accepting some formulas of policy which are attractive through their logical precision but faulty by reason of their inadequacy to meet all the needs of the case. No one who is familiar with Shakespeare or with Wordsworth would arraign the English of incompetence in philosophic insight.

Our heads are not empty of thought, however reluctantly thought jumps from our tongues. A mixed people, as Defoe described us, we have a mixed philosophy. Charged under Providence with a miscellaneous mission in the world, our policy is a mosaic of miscellaneous presuppositions. In the crisis of our educational controversy in the seventeenth century, we had somehow or other to square the experience of Nicholas Ferrar and Edwin Sandys in Virginia with the experience of the General Court of New England and with the hesitancies of New Hampshire and Rhode Island. More than a century later in our history it was a wise and calm-minded man who said that if you bound in one cover Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* and Tom Paine's *Rights of Man,* the two together would make a good book. A generation afterwards, when in 1833 the British Government created the Committee of Council on Education, Lord John Russell announced that it was Her Majesty's wish "that the rights of conscience should be respected." The obdurate convictions of diverse groups in the community had made it clear to our legislators that England, though it needed modern education, would not tolerate any state educational department which claimed absolute authority over the conscience, whether in religious belief or in the province of economic justice. In the famous Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, issued in 1843 and 1846, we find the outcome of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth's untiring effort to translate the principle of toleration into the administrative regulations of a modern Education Department. The idea of entrusting to the state and to its expert officials a monopoly of educational control over the national "culture" was, so far as England and Wales were concerned, decisively abandoned. The same policy, which had been reached in England at the cost of centuries of contention and bitter experience, was carried over into Indian education by the Despatch of the Court of Directors of the East India Company on July 19th, 1854. The despatch records the "natural conclusion that the most effectual method of providing for the wants of India in education will be to combine with the agency of the Government the aid which may be derived from the exertions and liberality of the educated and

wealthy natives of India and of other benevolent persons." Therefore the authors of the despatch had "resolved to adopt in India the system of grants-in-aid which has been carried out in this country with very great success . . . and the system will be based on an entire abstinence from interference with the religious instruction conveyed in the schools assisted." The two-mindedness of England has taught us a philosophy, now instinctive, though rarely formulated. We first practised the philosophy at home. Then we applied it to the dependent parts of the Commonwealth. Toleration, in its deepest sense, is *arcanum imperii*. And in no sphere of public effort is true toleration wiser or more necessary than in the sphere of education.

Unhappily for Europe, Germany addressed herself to the modern problem of educational policy without access to the experience which England had derived from her overseas responsibilities. More hemmed in by continental powers than we, she felt a little more hurried in her duty of internal reorganization. A late-comer into the new fields of industrial enterprise, she put more brains into her social policy as an accompaniment of her economic advance, and strove to recover lost ground by brilliant staff-work in educational planning. As fond of philosophy as the Scots, the Germans rejoiced in formulated principles, in which they rightly sought a guide to practical administration. A little prone by temperament to the joy of extreme conclusions, they swung themselves enthusiastically from the older tradition of particularism into the new implications of their imperial unity. The building up of the German systems of education during the nineteenth century was one of the capital achievements of political engineering. The results fascinated the world. Unfortunately they intoxicated the Germans. One of the most clear-eyed of Germans, Dr. Walther Rathenau, has recently described the event. "Instead of the Germany of thought and spirit, one saw suddenly a brutal, stupid community of interested persons, greedy for power, who gave themselves out as that Germany whose opposite they were; who, unable to point to any thought of their own, prided themselves on an imaginary race-unity which their very appearance contradicted: who had no ideas beyond rancour, the slaverings of league-oratory and

subordination; and who with these properties, which they were pleased to call *Kultur*, undertook to bring blessing to the world. . . . The system looked like a nation. In reality it was an autocratic association of economic interests bristling with arms."[1]

Without a further penny of tribute, Germany has paid her indemnity to the world. She has proved the falsity of the ideal which poisoned her judgment. The foundation of that ideal lay in the thought that education can "impart a community of ideas, purposes, traditions, institutions, accurately indicated by the German word *Kultur*." The German policy held that this vitally influential agent, education, must be "a government function." State education should be dominant. "Education is legitimately to be controlled by Government for the production of a common culture." We see how large an element of truth there is in this theory. Education *is* a power. But we see also how perilous is any thoroughgoing application of the theory and how liable it is to be infected by false ideals. The theory is not dead. It still has power over many minds in Britain and elsewhere. To such people, sincerely patriotic as they feel themselves to be, it seems to offer a short-cut to national unity and strength. Plato cherished the doctrine, and who can wonder if it appeals to lesser minds than Plato's? In spite of the lessons of the war, it lingers in some passages of Dr. Monroe's article. But it would appear from the concluding paragraphs of his paper that he feels a little uneasy as to its implications, and that the natural dictates of his heart and judgment lead him to rise above and beyond it.

America, like England, does not put all her educational eggs into one basket. She prefers a composite system, though rightly she lays the chief administrative emphasis upon that part of the system which is public in the sense of being governed by public authority and financed from public funds. Unlike England, America has had to create with all possible speed something like national unity among the mixed bodies of immigrants who have been poured through the funnel of New York harbour into the vast tankard of her population.

[1] Walther Rathenau. *The New Society* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1921), pp. 91-8.

The swifter the immigration and the more heterogeneous its ingredients, the more urgent have been the duty of developing the public school system and the desirability of getting people to believe in education as a national benefit. Consequently, to many Americans, education is one of the religions they really believe in. It has its orthodoxy, its pontiffs, its noble buildings. Education is the Established Church of the United States. And one need not be a thoroughgoing Erastian to see that benefit of state action in American education during a critical phase of American development. But the close observer soon discovers that state education has no monopoly in the United States. The Americans wisely retain another element in their educational system. The state universities of the Middle West, a conspicuous achievement of the last century, are none the worse for the existence of Harvard, Columbia and Yale. The public high schools gain from the juxtaposition of some of the private schools for boys and girls. The primary schools have learnt not a little from Dr. John Dewey's philosophy, tested by experiment in a private university school at Chicago. And in Dr. Monroe's article there are many references to the product of an old American tradition, much older than that of the ordinary state schools—a tradition which is strong in the influences which make for character, though dilatory in its welcome to new educational ideas and apt to fumble with antiquated methods of teaching. Between the mission field and this older tradition in American education the connexion has been close. Dr. Monroe is one of those who are bringing American missionary education into closer contact with the newer educational life of the United States. The combination, when effected, will be fruitful, but all the more fruitful if it does not exclude recruitment from that quieter and more conservative world in which time-honored ideas of education still hold sway.

Missionary education owes much to Germany and to Central Europe. Review the whole field and see how many admirable schools have derived their inspiration and their methods from those sources. It owes much to America, never more than at this hour. And it owes much to Britain;—to Scotland with her long-established reverence for learning and

to England with her full heart, her shy loyalties, her distrust of official systematization and her dislike of any tendency to overrate the value of technique.

Yet, in proportion to her sphere of administrative responsibility and influence, Britain (in spite of the infusion of Scots in her overseas service and missionary enterprise) has made a less alert use of the instrument of education than have Germany and America. The older among British overseas administrators did not put the teacher or the official of the Education Department into the seats of highest honour. As regards our public expenditure, frugality has found a field of exercise in the sphere of education. No one has ever charged British administration overseas with wild extravagance in its educational outlay. It might even occur to some observers that the older British administrators distrusted education for its own sake as well as disliking it because of its expense. The keen interest in educational reform, now noticeable among some British administrators, is a thing of yesterday. The badge of the older group of men (noble characters, many of them, in their self-sacrifice and equity) was hesitancy as to the benefits likely to be derived by the masses of any population (our own included) from a diffusion of modern Western education, especially when it worked through books and talk. Knowing how wise many of these men were, should we not take trouble to ascertain why they distrusted education, in spite of the assiduity of the Germans and the zeal of the Americans?

In one of his less known and fiercer writings,[1] John Henry Newman fell upon Sir Robert Peel for having stumbled into a false philosophy of education when he made a speech at the opening of a reading room in Tamworth. Sir Robert seems to have said that "in becoming wiser a man will become better" and that a widely diffused interest in knowledge, especially in physical knowledge, will contribute "to the intellectual and moral improvement of the community." Newman sharply retorts that "to know is one thing: to do is another: the two things are altogether distinct. A man knows he should get up in the morning,—he lies a-bed: he knows he should not

[1] J. H. Newman, *Discussions and Arguments* (London: Longmans, 1897), pp. 254 ff. (Letters on the Tamworth Reading Room, 1841.)

lose his temper, yet he cannot keep it. A labouring man knows he should not go to the alehouse and his wife knows she should not filch when she goes out charing; but nevertheless, in these cases, the consciousness of a duty is not at one with the performance of it." Newman's charge against Peel, and against the facile optimism of the school of thought which Peel was echoing, is that modern education of the superficial type "makes no pretense of subduing the giant nature in which we were born, of smiting the loins of the domestic enemies of our peace, of overthrowing passion and fortifying reason." It does "but offer to bribe the foe for the nonce with gifts which will avail for that purpose just so long as they *will* avail, and no longer." Then, with rising emotion, he concludes: "If virtue be a mastery over the mind, if its end be action, if its perfection be inward order, harmony and peace, we must seek guidance in graver and holier places. . . . The problem for statesmen of this age is how to educate the masses; and literature and science cannot give the solution. Faith, not Knowledge or Argument, is our principle of action. . . . Intrinsically excellent and noble as are scientific pursuits and worthy of a place in a liberal education, and fruitful in temporal benefits to the community, still they are not, and cannot be, the instruments of an ethical training. The apprehension of the unseen is the only known principle of subduing moral evil, educating the multitude and organizing society. And whereas man is born for action, action flows not from inferences, but from impressions—not from reasonings but from Faith."

It was from an instinct like that which Newman thus attempts to put into words that the older type of Englishmen (and many still living) distrusted the panacea of education. Many of them were unbelievers, but wanted the masses to believe. Some had a wistful reverence for the Christian religion but regarded it as a lost cause which the enlightened must discard. Many, especially in India, would have liked the public schools to teach religion but shrank from the political peril of seeming to attempt interference with the religious faiths of the people. Consequently, their interest in education was weakened by hesitations. Their hand faltered on the plough-tail before the furrow had been cut. But there

is this to be said for their psychological insight. Both in Germany and America, where modern education was effectively pressed home on the masses of the people, it was exalted into something very like an article of faith. But the critical English mind is not idolatrous, and feels some distaste for what it suspects of being half a fetich.

There was another cause, hardly less profound, for the English distrust of systems of state education for the masses. What, these men asked, is the implicit social aim of the education which you propose to provide and to compel people to receive. What is its suppressed premise? What its unconscious principle? Is it the purpose which Samuel Taylor Coleridge borrowed from Fichte—Fichte who was a *fons et origo belli*—namely, "to form and train up the people of the country to *obedient,* free, useful and *organizable* subjects, citizens and patriots, living to the benefit of the state and prepared to die in its defence"? A noble doctrine, but how apply it to "subject" India? Is not, they asked, modern Western education based upon presuppositions of political freedom and of national independence? Is not the literature it calls in aid, is not the philosophy upon which it rests, soaked in presuppositions of political liberty? How far are you prepared to go in allowing the peoples whom you infect with these ideas to put them into practice? To the utmost limit, say I. Not so, said they.

More than that, education conveys ideas, and ideas are dynamite. Are you sure that the economic structure of a society based upon acquisition will be tough enough to stand the criticisms and the discontents of a hungry but intellectualized proletariat? This anxiety is still strong. As Dr. Monroe points out, "certain American states have recently passed very drastic laws directed towards controlling the economic and political beliefs of teachers. There has developed, or is developing, a new orthodoxy. The question of religious orthodoxy no longer interests the masses of the people or the government authorities. But the question of political and economic orthodoxy does." If one admits (which I do not) that "education is the means for determining the culture of a people, and that all individuals should participate in such a culture," one finds it difficult, as Dr. Monroe

admits that he finds it difficult, to question the validity of a government's right to control the freedom and the spirit of the schools.

Yet what is education without freedom? And what warnings has not the human race received against empowering any human authority to prescribe what it shall believe and learn? Education should teach a way of life. It must teach it mainly by example, and in simple words for simple minds. But it must respect human personality. It must reverence truth. It must be disinterested. It must honestly open new windows in the mind. Dr. Monroe evidently regrets some recent tendencies in American educational administration just as our great-grandfathers regretted the window-tax. But if the claim of the secular Government to the control of opinion through the schools is once admitted, no one can legitimately blame Government for taking measures of disciplinary coercion against new ideas which happen to be unpalatable to it.

Mr. Bernard Shaw, who allows himself poetic licence when he writes about education, thinks that even in England our teachers are muzzled. "Is there any hope in education?" he asks in his preface to *Back to Methuselah*.[1] "The usual answer is that we must teach citizenship and political science at school. The hard fact is that we must *not* teach political science or citizenship at schools. The schoolmaster who attempted it would soon find himself penniless in the streets without pupils, if not in the dock pleading to a pompously worded indictment for sedition. Our schools teach the morality of feudalism corrupted by commercialism, and hold up the military conqueror, the robber baron and the profiteers as models of the illustrious and the successful. . . . There is no way out through the schoolmaster. Mankind cannot be saved by schoolmasters or by any other sort of masters. It can only be lamed or enslaved by them."

But the crucial test of the theory that the state is to develop a national social "culture" through its schools was made in Germany before the war. "On balance," writes Dr. Walther Rathenau, "the endowments of the German people work out as follows:—High qualities of intellect and heart.

[1] London: Constable, 1921. Pp. x ff.

Ethics and mentality normal. Originative will-power and independent activity weak. We give our devotion freely, and the heart rules in action. Our feelings are genuine and powerful. We have courage and endurance. . . . But in obedience we know no limit, and never question what is imposed on us. . . . For character and will we substituted discipline. But discipline is not nationality: it is an external instrument, and, when it breaks, it leaves—nothing."[2]

In a striking passage in his article in the last issue of this Review, Dr. Monroe writes that "during the past two hundred years two great political forces have been operative in society —that of democracy and that of nationality." But he would doubtless allow that, along with these, other great political forces have been at work. Such are individualism, industrial and commercial enterprise, internationality, and militarism. Some of these forces are discordant with one another. Hence have sprung the struggles, inward and outward, in all peoples in modern history. An educational discipline which sought to concentrate in the life of a nation one or two of these forces, and set itself to repress or ignore the others, would in course of time explode. In Germany, the explosion has already taken place. Modern education needs many safety valves. The theory that the state should by means of education repress tendencies which are disagreeable to its taste suggests a policy of sitting on the safety valves.

National education in the true sense is a spirit of living influence, a spiritual and intellectual atmosphere. It may, or it may not, exert much of its influence through some mechanism, new or old—through a mechanism expressly set up for the purpose or by traditional convenience employed for it. True, it comprises many material things, such as buildings, equipments, books, laboratories, as well as much systematic organization such as are rules for the order of studies, for the licensing of teachers, for the conduct of inspection and for the apportioning of money grants. But national education is not a mechanical fabric of codes and subsidies. It is a much more penetrating and subtle thing. Its chief influences are spiritual and atmospheric and therefore for the most part unorganizable. In their operation they are little subject to

[2] *The New Society*, pp. 92, 97.

bureaucratic control. For the erection of a national system of education in any true sense of the words there is required either a stable order of society on which to build (and a stable order of society implies a stable faith) or such a moment of ardent spiritual unity as sometimes, though not always, follows a collapse of the outer fabric of national life. The inner life of a people, its character and predisposition, determine the main lines of its education. No system of education, artificially constructed and imposed upon it, can permanently change the inward character of the people or, even under the arrogant name of *Kultur,* shape its life. National education is not a matter of schools alone. It requires schools: it requires the organized provision of good and tested teaching in all subjects necessary to be learnt. In this manner, intellectually, it knits the generations each with each. More than this, it must seek to furnish opportunities for the effective development and training of individual wills. But, essentially, it is a sort of envelope of varied influences (some didactic, some social, some economic, some mental) which act on the sympathies, the imagination, the judgment and the will, stimulating all alike into activity but imparting no identity of belief or of ideal or of prejudice. All that it can do is to impart a certain uniformity of tone to the complexion of the mind, a certain predisposition to conform to a general type. And fortunate is the nation which by inbred power produces variations of type and has diversity in its unity. Such a nation may not be able to boast of a tidily organized "system of national education," but it may produce great poets and sages, great captains in war and in industry, great statesmen and divines, and unknown heroes and heroines. It may enrich the world with new discoveries and with creative ideas. It brooks no standardized culture. It has an instinctive dread of a system of education which makes people intellectually impressionable without at the same time increasing their reserve of moral strength. It suspects that it is possible to overstimulate the intellectual susceptibility of large numbers of people of mediocre talent, without adding much to the sound stock of critical and practical judgment. And, above all, while heartily admiring some of the achievements of modern state education and sorrowfully admitting its own

shortcomings in regard to educational liberality and to educational technique, such a people realizes the fact that modern education has been on the whole a destructive force, scouring away old traditions, disturbing old ways of life, breaking down former restrictions and discrediting old valuations. A critical and eliminatory force of this kind may have been needed by the modern world. Revolutions do not happen without cause. But our final judgment upon some modern educational ideas may be reserved until we have seen to what reconstruction of society they lead. As we are not inclined to admire what Dr. Rathenau calls "an excitable and loquacious generation, prizing success and hostile to all superiority," we may well continue to allow a certain variety in our educational influences and institutions, in order that temporarily unpopular or temporarily undervalued ways of life may still have shelter in some corners of our national education.

How different and how difficult are the problems of education with which we teachers, whether at home or in the mission field, have to contend! Are we not right, though we respect profoundly the skilled practitioner in the act of teaching, in distrusting any cocksureness in educational prescriptions? Education, as Dean Church said,[1] is "one of the greatest and hardest tasks which it lies on each generation of human society to fulfil. So great, so difficult, so full of unexplored and unknown conditions, and apparently contradictory requirements that human thought and human wisdom are not wide enough to take in the whole field it presents to them; they still stand perplexed and baffled before many of its important problems. . . . We come more and more to see how in all its parts it must be a combination of authority and liberty: how essential it is that with discipline and control there should also be frank confidence and trust: how teacher and scholar act and react on one another: how much the scholar has to give and to teach, how greatly he must be induced to contribute to his own education, if it is to be a successful one. . . . In the eventful and hazardous interval which all must cross between childhood and manhood, two terrible powers of evil are to be met with in each man's path—ignorance and sin. If education is to

[1] *Pascal and other Sermons* (London: Macmillan, 1896), p. 217.

have its perfect work, both must be encountered, both must be defeated. It only fulfils half its office, it works with a maimed and distorted idea, unless it deals with character as well as with intelligence: unless it opens and enlightens the mind, as well as directs and purifies and fortifies the will." Dean Church here speaks of education as if it ended at school or college. But no one knew better than he that education begins in the cradle and ends on the death-bed.

Initiation into a way of life is therefore a desirable, if not an indispensable, element in a liberal education. Religion assigns their relative values to the various good things which a man may enjoy but must learn how to use. Education in its wider sense is therefore impoverished unless it has the directive guidance of religion and its help in discriminating between the worthy and the less worthy ideals of life. Life may become brutish and bleak without religion. And what is true of life is true also of education, because education is the accompaniment of life as well as a preparation for it.

We believe that the Christian faith and the Christian experience teach, reveal, communicate the Way, the Truth and the Life. This is the priceless treasure of a Christian education.

In its most intense forms, Christian education seeks some degree of seclusion, of immunity from discordant and disquieting interruption. It invites us to submit heart and mind to an influence which is concentrated and unified, though not narrow in its outlook or unfaithful to new truth. Some temperaments, it is true, are repelled by anything that savours of the seminary. And, out of the great multitude of schools and colleges aided by public funds, only a few may be able to conform to a type of education so exclusive. Even in our Christian schools we find it necessary to admit to the teaching staff some who do not profess the Christian faith. But we are thankful that under modern conditions of public opinion and of government we can usually secure in our publicity-aided institutions in England and elsewhere so much at any rate of opportunity for Christian teaching and training as enables those who desire to do so to learn the Way and the Truth, which, if believed in, determine for us

the relative values of what life can offer. The Christian faith helps us to know our duty. Where this is made impossible by the Government, the Christian school has no choice. It must refuse to accept the conditions imposed by the Government. But we may take some pride in the fact that, wherever modern English example has influenced educational administration, reasonable toleration has hitherto prevailed. Such toleration will be less likely to prevail if Governments allow themselves to regard national education as a province in which, for political reasons, they are at liberty to impose an orthodoxy of their own. But only those whose knowledge of educational history is imperfect would expect such restrictive methods of educational governance to succeed for long. Statesmen, however wilful and authoritative, cannot systematize the unsystematizable.

THE CRISIS IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN THE MISSION FIELD

By J. H. OLDHAM, M.A.

THE question with which this paper is concerned is whether Christian colleges and schools in the mission field are facing a real crisis in their existence; whether as the result of far-reaching changes they are in danger of losing largely or entirely the position of influence they have hitherto held; and, whether, if this danger exists, there is any means of successfully averting it. In seeking an answer to this question we shall consider, first, the service rendered to non-Christian peoples by Christian education in the past; secondly, the new forces which threaten to diminish and restrict its influence and to reduce it from the preëminent position it has held to that of an inconsiderable factor in the education of these peoples; and thirdly, the nature of the policy which the new situation demands, if Christian education under the changed conditions is to make a contribution to the life of the peoples of Asia and Africa comparable to the great contribution which it has made in days gone by.

I

It is necessary only to recall to mind a few familiar facts to realize how remarkable a contribution missionary colleges and schools have made to the education of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

In the African continent Christian missions have been the chief, and in some parts the sole, agency for extending to the races of that continent the benefits of education. In Dr. Loram's *Education of the South African Native,* published in 1917, it is stated that all but three of the several thousand native schools [in South Africa] are conducted

by missionary agencies. The following figures for British colonies for the year 1916 are significant:

	Total schools	*Mission schools*
Gambia	10	9
Sierra Leone	125	119
Gold Coast	589	569
Southern Nigeria	1108	1059
British East Africa	32	31
Uganda	1337	1337
Nyasaland	2054	2054

In Northern Nigeria, conditions are different, as the population is Mohammedan and the Government has established a system of schools on Mohammedan lines. It has to be borne in mind also that the figures given above do not convey a quite accurate impression of the proportionate share of Government and missions in the work of education. Apart from the contribution by Government in the shaping of policy, oversight and inspection and grants-in-aid, which in some areas are substantial, the few institutions maintained by Government are generally of a model character and superior in standard and equipment to the majority of the mission schools. But even when full allowance is made for this the figures quoted are remarkable.

The statistics for the German colonies before the war are as follows (1911):

	Total schools	*Mission schools*
German Southwest Africa	54	54
German East Africa	1001	918
Kamerun	531	525
Togo	324	319
New Guinea	432	429
Samoa	329	327
Kiaochow	39	26

In the Belgian Congo and in Portuguese Africa the work of education is almost entirely in the hands of the missions.

The responsibility of the western nations which have assumed control of the African continent for the education of the peoples under their rule is now widely recognized.

The conception of trusteeship in the government of politically backward races clearly involves not merely the protection of them against injustice and exploitation but the opening to them of those sources of knowledge and of moral and spiritual illumination and strength which will enable them to grow and develop and to hold their own in the strenuous and exacting conditions of the highly complex life of to-day. In this task, which is now seen to be a plain moral duty that cannot be set aside, Christian missionaries have been engaged with steadily increasing effort for more than a hundred years. It is a signal testimony to the power of Christ in modern life that the forerunners, pioneers and principal agents in the education of the African races should have been those who call themselves His disciples and find their master motive in the desire to build up His kingdom.

In the Turkish Empire as it existed before the war the work of enlightenment and the spread of modern knowledge was due almost entirely to the missionary institutions, many of them splendidly equipped, established (in the main) by American mission boards. A competent authority has attested that every political and social leader in the Balkan States received his education at Robert College, Constantinople.*

In India, according to the latest *Quinquennial Review of Education* (1912-17), one-fourth of the students at present receiving college education are studying in Christian institutions. Two of the three arts colleges for women in the Madras Presidency and thirty-two of the forty high schools for women are missionary institutions. But more important even than this very considerable share of Christian missions in the task of education is the influence which has been exerted by missionaries on the whole development of modern education in India. It is hardly an exaggeration to say, as one writer has said, that it would be possible to give a fairly complete account of the growth of Western education in India by writing the biographies of a few Scottish missionaries. The recent Calcutta University Commission, which included distinguished representatives of the Hindu and Mohammedan communities, bears emphatic testimony to the contribution of Christian missionaries to education in India. "Their insight and practical experience are of the utmost value to the whole educational system; their example, a source of much strength; their aspirations, an enrichment of its ideals. What they and their foregoers have accomplished in the field of education has been an estimable boon to the country."*

* Dr. Rendel Harris quoted in *The Riddle of Nearer Asia* by Basil Mathews.

China has gained its knowledge of the West largely through missionary institutions, and many of the distinguished leaders of the new China have received their education in missionary schools. Both the present Chinese minister in London and his predecessor and many other Chinese occupying positions of equal prominence are graduates of Christian institutions. The West China Christian University is at present the only institution of college grade in the three western provinces in China, with the result that most of those who have received a college education in West China are Christians.

Missionaries had a substantial share in the education of the leading actors in the transformation of Japan, and in searching for the first beginnings of the Imperial University of Tokyo we are led back to a class under the care of the famous missionary Dr. Verbeck.

To the facts which have been here quoted by way of illustration many others might be added, but enough has been said to show that the record of the contribution of the Christian Church to the education of the peoples of Asia and Africa is a chapter of real greatness in the history of Christianity for which we may be profoundly thankful.

II

It would be fatal, however, to allow this remarkable achievement to beget in us any feeling of complacency or of confidence in the future based upon the past. It would be fatal, because the conditions under which the great contribution of missionary colleges and schools has been made have passed, or are rapidly passing, beyond recall. Simply to carry on our activities on the old lines will bring us a

* Report of Calcutta University Commission, Vol. IV, p. 456.

rude awakening. To suppose that because missionary education has had in the past great achievements to its credit there lies in store for it an equally great future is to live in a fool's paradise. It is not merely that no spiritual movement can continue solely by the force of its own momentum and that the difficult and costly work of spiritual creation has in every generation to be performed afresh. That would be true if the conditions in which Christian education made its notable contribution in the past remained the same. But they are no longer the same. Our work to-day and in the future has to be done in an entirely different kind of world. Unless the significance of this fact in all its wide bearings is recognized and acted upon, the great days of Christian education in Asia and Africa will belong to the past and not to the future. All that will be left to missionary institutions will be a position of steadily diminishing power and influence.

Three new, powerful, and growing forces are undermining the position which missionary schools and colleges have hitherto held and threaten to restrict or weaken their influence. It is essential to the future of Christian education in the mission field to recognize clearly what these forces are and how fundamental is the change they are bringing about in the conditions which Christian education has to meet.

In the first place, governments everywhere are assuming responsibility for education. No more than in the West can this development be stayed, nor would one wish it to be stayed, since only in this way can there be any wide diffusion of the benefits of education. But it must inevitably bring about a change in the relative position of missionary schools, as it has already done in Japan.

The position of missionary institutions in the past has been that of pioneers. They have either had the field to themselves or have for a time at least been one of the strongest educational forces. They have been enormously aided by the fact that they represented the Western civilization which Asiatic and African peoples desired to understand and assimilate and were better qualified than indigenous institutions to mediate a knowledge of that civilization. But

the days when missionary schools were pioneers in education are strictly numbered, where they are not, as in a large part of the mission field, already gone. The state has begun to undertake the task of education, and it is impossible for private effort to compete with its vastly superior resources, derived from taxation. From this consequence there is no escape. Schools maintained from public funds will rapidly outnumber those dependent on private subscriptions. From being the whole, or a half or a quarter of the whole, mission schools will come to number one-tenth, one-twentieth, or one-hundredth of the total number of schools. Unless they can make up in quality for the loss they are bound to suffer quantitatively, their relative influence in the field of education must inevitably diminish. As a quantitative factor in the general system of education missionary institutions must decrease in importance. This is not an acceptable conclusion. But whether we like it or not there is no getting away from the conclusion so far as it relates to numerical strength. If there is any escape, it can be found only in the direction of quality. Numerical preponderance, or, as time goes on, even quantitative importance, is out of the question. The only chance for missionary institutions is that they should retain a leadership in the distinctive character of their achievements and results. Unless they can do this, the conclusion is irresistible that the great days of Christian education in the mission field are behind us and not ahead.

If there is no escape from this conclusion, it is important to observe that some of the institutions which are at present being maintained offer no prospect at all of success in the direction in which alone success may be hoped for. A missionary institution in which the staff is composed largely of non-Christian masters or is so insufficient for its tasks that its energies are exhausted in reaching the bare minimum of academic requirement is not likely to produce results noticeably superior to those of other schools. The school may have done some good when it was the only source of education available; but for the purpose we are here considering it counts for nothing. For if the statement that the only chance for missionary schools is to make

up in quality for the loss they are bound to suffer quantitatively has any meaning it must mean that they leave on those who come under their influence a mark different from that of other institutions. It is not sufficient that they should themselves believe and hope that they are accomplishing this; the result must be apparent to disinterested and impartial observers, Christian and non-Christian. Nor can we be satisfied if some of our institutions are in their immediate locality successfully meeting this test. For the question we are discussing is not whether Christian missions can continue to maintain a few schools which in their power to mould and train character are above the average; it is whether this can be done in so marked, conspicuous and incontrovertible a manner that Christian colleges and schools notwithstanding their limitation in number will be recognized as making by the quality and distinction of their work a contribution to the whole educational progress of the country comparable in value to the contribution they have made in the past.

This brings us to the second new factor with which Christian education in the mission field has to reckon. Everywhere it has to meet new and higher standards. In the West recent years have witnessed great advances in educational theory and practice. Scientific study has shed a flood of new light on the processes of the human mind, and is bringing about far-reaching changes in ideas regarding the aims and methods of education. There has been a rapid development of educational technique. Great progress has been made in the adaptation of education to the life, environment and real needs of the pupils. With these far-reaching changes in thought and practice it has not been easy for missionary administrators and educators, overburdened as they are, to keep in touch. But while (of course, with notable exceptions) they have been too busy and preoccupied to absorb it, this wealth of new knowledge has been steadily finding its way to the countries where missionaries work. Hundreds of students from Japan and China have come to study in the more advanced educational institutions of the West. Professor Monroe in his paper has called attention to the fact that the standards of professional

attainment for teachers are higher in Japan than in the United States.

There was a time when mission education was in many places the only education; its standards were the only standards. In the universal lack of educational facilities it might seem that any education was better than none. This does not mean that missionary educators as a whole were satisfied with low standards. In practically every mission field missionaries were in a real and large sense the leaders of the educational movement and this leadership has in many fields been retained to the present day. But it remains true that for a time in many parts of the mission field missionary schools had nothing against which to measure themselves and that that time has gone by or is rapidly passing. Where in the old days the missionary was the only or the most highly qualified teacher he has now in many instances been outdistanced by natives of the country. Missionary societies are still too ready to appoint to the charge of educational work those who have no professional training in education. The consequence is that a considerable proportion of our educational work (if we take the whole mission field into view) is in danger of being regarded by educational administrators and trained educators as second-rate. We cannot commend our Gospel by that which is second-rate. People will always judge Christianity not by the ideals which we profess but by the actual expression of it which they see. In so far as Christian education is educationally inferior it will not further but hinder the Christian cause. Missionary institutions are under a grave disadvantage from the fact that they are largely foreign; if in addition they are subject to the handicap of being second-rate, their task may well seem hopeless.

As we set ourselves to the task of the evangelization of the world, its magnitude grows. Many have conceived of it as reaching with the Christian message every human being on the surface of the globe. That is part of it. But human life has depth as well as extension. There are continents of human thought and effort to be conquered for Christ, which are as real a part of God's world as the physical continents where human beings live who have never heard the Gospel message. To scale the heights and sound the depths is as

necessary a part of the missionary task as to traverse the length and breadth of the world we are called to evangelize.

The third new factor with which Christian education has to reckon is that to which Professor Monroe has forcibly directed attention in his paper. He there points out that the view has gained widespread acceptance that the basis of nationality is a common culture, that this culture is an artificial produce and that the place where it can be manufactured is in the schools. Education comes thus to be thought of as a process controlled by the State for political ends. The logical conclusion of this view is that education should be exclusively in the hands of officials of the State. Where policy stops short of this final stage, the tendency is to make increasing demands on private effort in education in the direction of making it conform to the requirements of State education. To this view Professor Monroe regards all modern governments as in the main committed.

It is obvious that the triumph of this view must close the door to missionary education. The difficulties which Christian education has to face in Japan and especially in Korea arise out of the view of many Japanese authorities that education is entirely a function of the State. Leaders of the new China see in education the means of regenerating their country and the instrument for effecting this is a national system of education. The demand for "national education" is an outstanding feature of the nationalist movement in India. In so far as the leaders of a nation are seeking to develop a strong nationality by diffusing a common national culture through the schools, they are not likely to regard foreigners as well qualified to assist in this task. Professor Monroe at the conclusion of his papers points out in words that will command general assent that the special function of missionary educational institutions is as private and independent agencies "to point the way to educational advance through their greater freedom of initiative and experimentation," and as inspired by the religious motive to formulate and work out a scheme of education which will "include essential elements of culture and personality which are apt to be minimized or neglected in the mass education controlled by the public." But if the conception of education as a process controlled by government for

cultural and political ends holds the field, there remains a very limited and precarious opportunity for missionary education to render these valuable services. No issue could be raised of more vital concern to Christian educators, and the whole missionary body is under a debt of gratitude to Professor Monroe for having raised it so clearly.

In judging of the claims of national education there are two aspects of the question which need to be clearly distinguished. There is a sense in which the demand for national education must meet with the fullest sympathy of Christian missions. It is not their business nor their desire to impose on other peoples the ways of thinking, the customs, the traditions and the social institutions of the West. It is of the very nature of the Catholic Church of Christ that all peoples should bring to it their distinctive gifts. The Christian fellowship will be richer and fuller in proportion as all peoples are able to express their characteristic qualities in their own way. Christian missions have doubtless failed to rise to the heights of their own faith. There is room for a still deeper appreciation by missionary educators of the literature, art and social heritage of the peoples among whom they are working and more rapid progress needs to be made in transferring the control of education from foreign to native hands. Missions will also be called on more and more to meet the legitimate demand that instruction should be given in the language of the country. We can successfully combat what is false in the conception of national education only by doing the fullest justice to the elements of truth which it contains. But whatever defects there may have been in practice, the general principle that Christian education should in this sense become in every country as national as possible is not open to question.

It is an entirely different matter, however, when the claim is made that education should be a process controlled by the State for political ends. The State has a responsibility for the education of its citizens. Education is the means by which successive generations are linked to one another, and by which the rich heritage of the past is handed on to the new age. The individual in isolation is nothing; it is only through contact with the life around him and through entering into the meaning of the institutions which the experience of the

nation has built up that he can attain true personality. The school of thought which has emphasized this view of education has given expression to a profound truth. But, as Sir Michael Sadler has pointed out, national education is not something that can be mechanically imposed by codes and systems. "Its chief influences are spiritual and atmospheric and therefore for the most part inorganizable. In their operation they are little subject to bureaucratic control. . . . The inner life of a people, its character and predisposition, determine the main lines of its education."

The development of distinct and strongly marked national types is of advantage to the world. It brings an enrichment to human life. It is of advantage also to the individual by furnishing him with a rich soil of historical achievement and tradition, of tried custom and cherished ideals in which his personality may find root and from which it may draw strength. But these gains are bought at too high a price if no room is left for variation and diversity and the growth of new ideas. To attempt to impose artificially on the character of a people the ideas which commend themselves to those who happen to be in power at the time is bound to cramp and distort the national growth. Life is far too rich and varied and our ignorance of its meaning and forms of expression is still far too profound to make it wise to entrust the entire control and direction of education absolutely to the care of any small band of administrators, however competent and technically qualified they may be. The attempt to force the whole life of the nation into channels predetermined by authority is bound sooner or later to result in explosion. The path of true wisdom is surely, as Sir Michael Sadler says, "to distrust any cocksureness in educational prescriptions" and "to allow a certain variety in our educational influences and institutions, in order that temporarily unpopular or temporarily undervalued ways of life may still have shelter in some corners of our national education."

When we approach the question from the Christian standpoint we cannot fail to recognize a fundamental opposition between the Christian conception of the meaning of life and a narrowly conceived policy of national education, imposed on all by State authority.

Belief in the value of human personality is fundamental in the Christian view of life. Man is an end in himself, not a means. When the State sets out to educate its citizens for its own purpose, it comes to look on them as means rather than ends. At its worst such education degrades men to the level of chattels. But in any case to think of men primarily as citizens is to isolate certain duties which, however important, touch only a part of life, and to lose sight of the totality of their spiritual obligations and opportunities. A conception of education much more akin to the Christian view is expressed by a recent writer when he defines the purpose of education as the diffusion of "the sense of wonder and curiosity and the gift of mutual sympathy and companionship" and declares that "the uneducated man is not he who cannot read or write or count or spell, but he who walks unseeing and unhearing, uncompanied and unhappy, through the busy streets and glorious open spaces of life's infinite pilgrimage." The purpose of Christian education is to free human nature from the bonds of ignorance and sin and to release its powers and energies for the service of God and man. In seeking these objects it cannot consent to be restricted and bound by narrower aims.

As Christians, moreover, we believe in a universal Kingdom of God, in a fellowship that transcends differences of race and colour, of nationality and class. While we value the contribution which every race and every distinctive national achievement in thought, literature, art, political organization, or social development is able to make to the understanding and enrichment of life, our hope as Christians leaps forward to the fullness of truth and complete fellowship, of which these achievements are only the partial and limited expression. An education which sets aside this larger ideal and is concerned exclusively with forming a narrower loyalty is one with which we cannot rest content.

These ideas, while they are essentially Christian, are shared by many who do not call themselves by that name. They would agree that to force education into too narrow moulds or to attempt to impose universally the prevailing orthodoxy of the moment must lead to disastrous consequences. There is, however, a third reason why Christian schools must claim

freedom of opportunity and a place of their own within a national system. Christianity claims to reveal and communicate the Way, the Truth and the Life. From the Christian standpoint no education that is divorced from the Christian faith can be adequate; far less one that is based, whether expressly or indirectly, on non-Christian or anti-Christian assumptions. The only kind of education which Christian missions can give is one in which their faith can find free and full expression. We cannot expect that those who are not themselves Christians should believe that Christian education has a special value, though as a matter of fact many of them do believe this on the ground of its recognizable moral and social fruits. But no thoughtful statesman can fail to be aware that the transformation of human nature and its conversion to social purposes is a task of enormous difficulty, that failure to effect such transformation has been widespread and that the disastrous consequences to society of that failure have never been so evident as to-day; and it might seem to a broad-minded administrator, even though not himself a believer in Christianity, a not unreasonable claim that a type of education which in the building of character is not behind other types and which has some conspicuous achievements to its credit should so far as practical conditions permit be allowed an opportunity of doing its work in its own way. It does not seem too much to expect that a government alive to the real problems of human society should recognize the force of this plea; and that it should concede, further, that the existence of schools of a special type might by their freedom of initiative and distinctive aims and methods help to vitalize and enrich the whole education of the country.

The conclusion to which these arguments point has been expressed in weighty and memorable words by the Calcutta University Commission. In a chapter in their report on "Government and Private Effort" the Commission points out that as a result of modern standards of excellence and efficiency and of the consequently enhanced cost, education is steadily passing out of the category of private effort into the category of those public services which are supported from taxation, and that this change inevitably brings with it an increase of State control. But they go on to point out that

"at the heart of the matter there is an element of danger in any great extension of governmental control over schools. Education is not wholly a matter of public concern. It lies across the boundary which divides public functions from private initiative. It is too important a factor in national life for the State to abrogate its responsibilities in regard to it. But at the same time it is too intimately connected with family life and with private conviction to be entrusted to governmental management alone. Therefore, it is desirable to seek for some new synthesis between State supervision and private effort, especially in the spheres of secondary and higher education."*

Let us try to make clear to ourselves the point to which our argument has brought us. We have been examining some of the powerful forces which are effecting a fundamental change in the position of mission schools and which threaten to restrict their influence or close the door of opportunity against them altogether. The first of these is the rapid extension of schools under public management, which necessarily diminishes the relative importance of private institutions. The second is the rise of new and far more exacting standards. The third is the spread of the conception of education as a function of the State to be employed for cultural and political ends. Where this view of education is interpreted in a narrow sense, whether it be by the awakening peoples of the East under the powerful influence of the nationalist spirit or by colonial governments who desire to impose on the people over whom they rule the ideas and culture of the governing power, missionary schools must necessarily be regarded as an uncongenial and disturbing element to be got rid of as quickly as possible. But this view of education is not merely a menace to the existence of mission schools, but, as we have seen, is contrary to the interests of true education. In resisting it, therefore, Christian missions are not simply defending their own special interests, but are standing for a higher and nobler view of education. Seen in this light the work of educational missions gains a wider significance. So far from their day of opportunity having passed, circumstances have made them to-day in many parts of the world in the early and critical stages of developing national systems of education the leading

* Calcutta University Report, Vol. I, p. 104.

representatives and exponents of private effort in education. In an issue that is world-wide and of vital importance to the well-being of mankind, they have the opportunity of standing for a conception of education which leaves a place for initiative, freedom, variety and elasticity, and keeps alive among men the belief that if it is to satisfy the whole of man's nature, education must bring the growing mind into living contact not only with that which is revealed to the senses, but with the eternal realities of the unseen and spiritual world. Far from being in danger of becoming a negligible factor in the developing educational systems of Asia and Africa missionary education, if only it is true to its own principles and can give them adequate expression, has a contribution to make of incalculable value. If they see their opportunity and seize it, missionary institutions may keep their place in the centre of the mainstream of the national life.

But no sooner have our eyes been opened to the immense significance of this contribution which mission schools may render, than we are compelled to recognize that in attempting to render this service they are subject to the grave disadvantage of their foreign origin. There appears to be only one way in which this serious handicap may be surmounted. It is that the education given by Christian schools should be so good, that its results should be so incontestably and manifestly beneficial (in the region, of course, of the formation of character, which is the peculiar and distinctive concern of Christian schools) that notwithstanding the foreign element in their work, their contribution will be recognized to be indispensable. Wherever the highest grade of excellence is reached, as in the contribution of General Armstrong at Hampton, or in that of Madame Montessori, we rise above distinctions of nationality to that which has universal validity. It is not necessary for educational achievements of this quality to press their claims on others; men and women from all lands come voluntarily to learn from them. Hampton and Tuskegee are institutions that are situated outside the foreign field, and yet they are exerting a profound missionary influence in that field. They are exerting that influence by leaving the impress of their ideals and principles on the minds of missionary educators from many countries. They are cited here not to suggest

that their type of education is the one most needed in all fields, but to illustrate the truth that the achievement of high excellence in any particular type of education may have not merely a national but a world-wide influence. It is not of course to be expected that all Christian schools should bear the stamp of genius; that we cannot command. But if the conditions which exist throughout a great part of the mission field have been truly described, it would appear that the only real chance of missionary schools continuing to hold the position they have held in the past lies in the super-excellence of their work. Thus from this fresh angle we are again brought back to the idea of quality as the fundamental requirement of success in missionary education in the conditions which prevail to-day.

III

If it has been established that the conditions under which missionary schools and colleges must do their work in the present and future are fundamentally different from those in which their past success has been achieved, it follows that a new policy is required to meet the new conditions. The changes to which attention has been directed, fundamental though they be, have come about gradually, and there has been in missionary work a certain measure of adaptation to meet them. But it does not appear that missionary thought as a whole has in any adequate degree awakened to the necessity of formulating a clearly defined policy to meet the new situation.

The contention of this paper has been that if we ignore these changes, or treat them lightly, and simply continue our work on the old lines, the position of Christian education in the mission field must inevitably be one of steadily diminishing influence. Is there any means by which such a consequence may be averted? In the remaining pages an attempt will be made to offer as a basis for further thought and discussion a tentative answer to this vital question.

But before doing so it is perhaps well to pause for a moment to meet a doubt which may suggest itself to some minds. Need it necessarily be regarded as a disaster, some

may ask, that governments should take over the work of education and that missions should be excluded from this field? May this not leave us the more free to devote all our energies to the primary work of direct evangelization? There are two strong, and it would seem conclusive, reasons for refusing to accept this view.

The first is that as believers in the Christian revelation we cannot afford anywhere, and least of all in a non-Christian country, to allow the growing mind to be moulded through all the formative years by views of the world and of human life which leave Christ out of account or are flatly incompatible with the truth which He has revealed and then expect that in a mind so formed an adequate place may in the end be found for Him. Christ claims to be the Way, the Truth and the Life; and if education is education for life He must be the heart and inspiring principle of the whole. To surrender education wholly to the State, especially if it be a non-Christian State, is tacitly to admit that the formation of a people's character and soul can be satisfactorily accomplished without reference to Him whom Christians believe to be the Light of the world.

The second reason why education is a necessary part of missionary effort is that it is the indispensable means of developing a native Christian leadership. It is a missionary commonplace that the peoples of Asia and Africa must be reached in the main by those of their own race. But the only way in which foreign missionaries can make themselves dispensable is by raising up educated native leaders capable of taking over their responsibilities. Till there are native leaders equal in education to the foreigners, leadership must inevitably remain in foreign hands, with all the attendant disadvantages. For Christian leaders of the kind required we must look in the main to Christian schools—schools in which the atmosphere is permeated by the Christian Spirit and the whole life bears the impress of the Christian view of the world and of human relationships. Unless Christian missions address themselves to the task of developing through education an adequate native Christian leadership the supreme need of the missionary enterprise will not be met.

We return after this brief digression to the question on

what conditions Christian education in the mission field may hope to continue to exercise an influence comparable to that which it has exerted in the past? The first necessity is that Christian missions should have a definite policy. It is essential that they should have clear ideas regarding the special character and distinctive aims of the education which they wish to give, its relation to the government system, and the means by which these aims can best be realized. At present there is no such policy. Individual mission boards may have a policy but Christian missions as a whole have no clearly conceived policy adapted to the different conditions in different parts of the mission field. This is a grave and, if the task and opportunity of Christian education at the present day have been rightly set forth, it may prove a fatal, weakness. The governments and departments of education in most of the countries with which we have to do have an educational policy designed to achieve the purposes to which they attach chief importance. If Christian institutions remain isolated and disunited in the field where these policies operate, they run the risk of being for one reason or another gradually pushed to the side, or it may be crushed out of existence.

In war the commander who is uncertain of his aims or who has failed to think out clearly the means of realizing them, is overwhelmed by the opponent who has a clearer and firmer purpose than his own. In business the man who takes the longest views and whose mind envisages most clearly all the factors in the situation, is the one who outdistances his competitors. The demands made by the missionary undertaking are not less exacting. Missionary institutions cannot expect to hold their own, or to render the immensely important service for which present conditions present the opportunity, unless they can meet the policies of governments with a considered policy of their own that does fuller justice to the essential facts of human nature and the real needs of human society. Ideas can be met only by truer ideas. A mistaken or one-sided policy can be countered only by a policy based on deeper insight and fuller understanding.

Steps of great importance have been taken in the past two years in the direction of formulating a policy of Christian education. Strong educational commissions under the auspices

of the mission boards of North America and Great Britain have visited India, Africa and China. At the time of writing only the Report of the Commission on Village Education in India has been published. Whatever other judgments may be passed on the Report of the Commission, it has at least done the essential service of providing Christian missions with a policy. One may differ from the policy proposed, but it is an immense advance to have something formulated with such definiteness that one can differ from it. Much work is still needed before the policy can be translated into the actual practice of the missions, but the broad outlines of a policy are there and this represents a great advance. It may be expected that the reports of the Commissions to Africa and China will render a similar service.

But while the report of a commission may be of the utmost value in laying down the lines of a policy, the task remains of seeing that this policy is translated into practice and of permeating the whole of missionary educational effort with its spirits and ideals. It is noteworthy that the commission on village education in India put forward as its first and fundamental recommendation the appointment of a group of educational advisers. The suggestion has not yet found general acceptance. But if the argument of this paper is sound it is incumbent on those who question the wisdom of the proposal to show some other way in which the truly critical problems of the present situation can be effectively met.

Few greater services could be rendered to missionaries engaged in educational work than to place at their disposal the advice of men who, relieved from other responsibilities, would have it as their first duty to study the educational needs of the field as a whole, to keep in close touch with the most living and progressive educational thought throughout the world, and to relate new educational ideas to the distinctive problems and tasks of Christian missions. Apart from the vitalizing effect of such an influence upon missionary thought and practice, the existence in each important mission field of one or more highly qualified educational specialists might prove to be the most effective, and in some instances perhaps the only, means of bringing about the right adjustment between Christian schools and the educational policy of the

Government. If the relations between missions and governments in education are left to occasions when a difficult and controversial matter has to be settled, the policy of the government may already have taken too definite a shape for a satisfactory adjustment to be made. If, on the other hand, the Minister of Education or, under colonial governments, the Director of Education, has at hand a representative of missionary education who is not only familiar with the circumstances of mission schools within the area, but has also a thorough and expert knowledge of education as a whole, links of friendship may be established, and understandings may be arrived at in the course of informal conversations regarding the educational needs of the area, that could not be brought about after government policy had taken definite shape without consultation with the missions.

It must, of course, be recognized that educational advisers, if they are to be equal to their responsibilities must possess exceptional gifts of educational insight and knowledge, of missionary statesmanship, and of the ability to secure the confidence and loyalty of men and women of very varied types. Where these gifts are lacking a plan of the kind proposed is likely to break down or to prove merely wasteful. If true insight is absent the advice given will be dangerous and misleading, instead of productive of good results. It is much better that no appointment should be made if the right men for posts of this kind are not available. But if there are men in the mission field who can render this service to the missionary cause, and who, not as dictators, but in the closest consultation with their fellow-workers, can help to work out the clear lines of a missionary policy, the service they could render would be invaluable. Such co-ordination of missionary policy and effort cannot be effected without cost, and it would be necessary for the mission boards to meet this cost. They can be induced to do so only if they come to see that without a clear and united policy the effectiveness of the whole of missionary educational effort is impaired, and in some fields even its continued existence imperilled. Our judgment on such a question as the appointment of educational advisers will be affected, if not determined, by our attitude towards the main thesis of this paper; by the degree, that is to say, in

which we are convinced that a fundamental change has taken place in the conditions under which missionary work has to be carried on, and that the only hope of success in the new situation is that the distinctive contribution of Christian education should find expression in a clear, definite and strong policy.

The second conclusion to which the argument seems to point is that inasmuch as Christian schools can achieve their purpose only by the distinctive character and quality of their work, there must be concentration of effort to ensure that the required standard is reached. What we do at all we must do well, even if we have to do less. This has been said so often that its repetition is wearisome. Yet the fact remains that mission boards are carrying on a good many schools at the present time without any other real justification than that a school was once started in a certain place. While such schools may once have served a useful purpose, conditions may have changed to such an extent that unless the school can be greatly improved its maintenance is no longer the best expenditure of mission funds. Missionary resources are so meagre and the task and opportunity of Christian education are so great, that we cannot afford to be content with anything less than the best. It is a trite saying that the good is often the greatest enemy of the best. But in practice it is often the truth which we most need to lay to heart. The power of imagination is so poorly developed in most of us, that the good which an existing institution is accomplishing is much more easily realized than the larger and better results which may be within our reach, but still lie in the region of the ideal. We see clearly the loss that would be suffered by the pupils of a particular institution if it were closed; we find it much more difficult to picture to ourselves the results which might come from new concentration and from the diversion of existing resources and energies into more promising channels. Even where an institution is manifestly accomplishing valuable results, its work must be viewed and tested not by its effect on its immediate surroundings, but in relation to the progress of Christianity in the whole field. The question with which we are here concerned, as has been already said, is not whether missionary education is able to do some good to

individuals, but whether it is still within the power of Christian educational missions to bear effective witness to Christ as the Way, the Truth and the Life, in the wide field of national life as they have done in the past. Once this is seen to be the real question, it becomes evident that an undertaking, which may perhaps be justified in relation to the narrow field over which its influence extends, may be contributing comparatively little to the success of the enterprise as a whole. We need to keep steadily before us all the time the thought of the evangelization of the world, and to make up our minds that our far too slender energies and resources will be spent in the ways that count for most.

A third truth which is brought home to us by the view of the function of Christian education which we have been considering is that for the accomplishing of the task which has been described personalities matter more than anything else. Curricula, equipment and technique have their place; but they are entirely subsidiary to the character of the men and women who are engaged in the work. President Garfield, in a saying that has often been quoted, declared that his idea of a university was a log with a boy at one end of it and Mark Hopkins at the other. If this expresses a truth in regard to education generally it has a special application to Christian education. Christianity is not a theory to be taught. It is essentially a life, which can be communicated only by those who themselves possess that life. The object of the Christian faith is a Person, and it is through persons that He has chosen to carry on His work. If Christian schools are to make their mark by the quality of their results, it will be because they are staffed by teachers of large mould, by men and women of vision and sympathy and character.

It is the function of mission boards to see that their institutions in the mission field are provided with such men and women. Their most important duty is to discover the best men and women and to set before them the appeal of missionary service. The surest way of attracting the finest type of missionary candidates is to present the opportunity of Christian education abroad in its full richness and splendour to their imagination. The bigger and nobler the terms in

which the task is conceived, the stronger will be its appeal to the finest spirits among the rising generation.

Having done its utmost to draw into missionary service the strongest men and women that can be found, a mission board has next to see that they receive the best possible equipment for their task. It is now generally recognized that it is foolish and wasteful to send out missionaries in charge of educational work without giving them the best professional equipment, though a long road has still to be travelled before this insight finds complete expression in practice, and all educational missionaries receive the preparation that their tasks demand. It is not enough, however, that missionaries, before they go out, should take the necessary professional courses to qualify them for their work. Means must be devised by which the teachers in mission schools, native as well as foreign, may be kept in touch with the living movement of educational thought, and some of them at least given the opportunity from time to time of seeing the very best that is being done in their particular line of work. These things have been said so often that the tendency of all of us is to yield them our wearisome assent and then go on with our work, leaving things as before. Only the clear recognition that there is a real crisis in Christian education in the mission field, and that indolent continuance in the old ways is to court certain disaster, can lead to redoubled efforts to secure for missionary service the best men and women that can be found and to a determination that they shall be given the best equipment that can be provided.

It would be possible to suggest other features of a comprehensive policy but it is perhaps best to limit ourselves for the present to emphasizing what appear to be the vital elements—a clear vision of the distinctive contribution of Christian education, carefully thought-out plans for making this contribution effective in the actual (and changing) conditions of each mission field, courageous concentration of effort, and the securing and proper equipment of the best men and women for missionary service. Stated thus the conclusions reached are open to the charge of being trite and obvious. Yet does not progress consist very largely in gaining fresh insight into familiar truths? Whatever value this paper may have

lies not in the conclusions formulated but in the ground on which they have been reached. The vital matter is whether it is true that profound changes have taken place in the world in which missionary schools and colleges have to make their contribution, that they can consequently maintain their position only by the high quality of their work, that they must be prepared to meet new and far more exacting standards and that only if they can succeed in expressing the Christian ideal of life in conspicuous and unmistakable form can they hope in the future to render a service comparable to what Christian education has achieved in the past. According to our estimate of what is implied in these contentions, we shall regard the conclusion to which they point as necessitating large and far-reaching changes in the next few years in the policy and practice of missionary societies and boards.

But how far, it may legitimately be asked, is the ideal for missionary education which has been suggested really practicable? Are there any parallels in the West for the function which it is proposed that missionary institutions in Asia and Africa should fulfil? It would not be difficult to answer this question affirmatively and to show what large services to sound education have been rendered in both Great Britain and America by great Christian educators and by schools in which the Christian motive and the Christian atmosphere have been the chief formative influence. But it has also to be borne in mind that if there is anything distinctive in the Christian conception of life, it ought to be possible for this to find even more striking and conspicuous expression in a non-Christian environment than in countries where Christian ideas have long been a leaven and have in some degree permeated the general life. And still more important is it to remember that what we are concerned with here is the missionary obligation. The missionary is from the nature of his calling a pioneer. Ideas of the adventurous and the heroic are inherent in the missionary undertaking. In many matters Christian missions have pointed the way to the Church at home. May it not be so again here? If the new call which comes to the missionary societies is to add to the physical continents which have already been occupied by Christian forces new continents of spiritual achievement and fulness of life, may not the magnitude of

the task, as the missionary appeal has always done, awaken fresh energies and lead to new creative effort?

The task is great and difficult but it is also exhilarating. It is the highest work in which men can engage. The only thing that can preserve human society at the present time from breaking up and restore it to health is a renewed conviction that human beings are the true wealth of the community and that the highest object of human endeavour is to make men. Of this conviction Christian education at its best is the expression. The belief is one that is shared by all true educators. But the tendency of all large scale government systems of education is to be content with smaller aims. The immediate requirement of colonial governments may be clerks or mechanics, of national governments disciplined and obedient citizens or such technical efficiency among their people as will enable them to compete successfully in the industry and markets of the world. Christian schools, unless they deny their own nature, must have as their primary and unambiguous purpose the making of men. And in the faith which they seek to propagate they possess the strongest motive and power, to redeem and transform weak and erring human nature. In concentrating on this task their whole energy Christian missions will take their place where they ought to stand, at the centre and living heart of the upward movement of mankind and will rally to their support all that is best and most Christian in the thought and aspiration of the time. The greatest days of missionary education may still lie ahead if we are able to see our task bigly enough and to rise to the full height of our calling.

And if at times the task seems long and uphill and the goal far distant, we may take comfort—so long as we are sure that we are not through narrowness or dulness of vision, through weakness or weariness, allowing ourselves to be content with a second best, since in this matter self-deception is easy—from the truth nobly expressed by William James, who writes in one of his letters:

> "As for me, my bed is made: I am against bigness and greatness in all their forms, and with the invisible molecular moral forces that work from individual to individual, stealing in through the

> crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, and yet rending the hardest monuments of man's pride, if you give them time. The bigger the unit you deal with, the hollower, the more brutal, the more mendacious is the life displayed. So I am against all big organizations as such, national ones first and foremost; against all big successes and big results; and in favour of the eternal forces of truth which always work in the individual and immediately unsuccessful way, under-dogs always, till history comes, after they are long dead, and puts them on the top."*

* "The Letters of William James," Vol. II, p. 90.

MSH 22513

END OF
TITLE